Volume XXXIX] *October, 1933* [*Number 1*

The

American Historical Review

ENGLAND AND DUNKIRK

On November 29, 1667, Evelyn visited Clarendon. It was the latter's last day in England. "I found him in his garden", the diarist notes, "at his new-built palace sitting in his gowt wheele-chayre, and seeing the gates setting up towards the north and the fields. He looked and spake very disconsolately. After some while deploring his condition to me, I tooke my leave. Next morning, I heard he was gon."[1]

This pitiful scene occurred about where St. James's and Albemarle streets meet Piccadilly. There on land granted him by the king three years before,[2] Clarendon had reared a great palace. Even during construction it was condemned as the product of ill-gotten wealth, particularly in connection with the sale of Dunkirk;[3] and within a few months after he had entered it (but not until he had buried his wife therefrom), he had to leave it forever. It was to have cost £20,000; it actually cost around £50,000. It was an unwise time—war, plague, fire—for ministers to spend even honest money lavishly. He had purchased and used some stones originally designed for use on St. Paul's. No one can deny that Clarendon gave his enemies splendid opportunities for criticism, and it is probable, as he himself thought, that the cry of "Dunkirk House" had much to do with his fall.[4]

[1] John Evelyn, *Diary*, Dec. 9, 1667 (incorrect date). There was ten days difference between Old Style (English) and New Style (Continental) dating at the time. Where only one date is given, it is O.S. if of an event in England and N.S. if of an event on the Continent. In footnote citations, dates follow the form of the source, *i.e.*, usually O.S. if originating in England, and N.S. if on the Continent. But French ambassadors sometimes (*e.g.*, D'Estrades in Aug.-Nov., 1662) used N.S. in their letters from England.

[2] It extended from Swallow Street west to Berkeley Street on the north side of Piccadilly. See C. L. Kingsford, *Early History of Piccadilly, Leicester Square, Soho, and their Neighborhood* (Cambridge, 1925), p. 104, citing Pat. Roll 16, Chas. II., pt. 15, no. 17, dated Aug. 23, 1664. T. H. Lister, *Clarendon* (London, 1837), III. 525–526, prints the king's order for the grant, dated June 13, 1664.

[3] Samuel Pepys, *Diary*, Feb. 20, 1665, and June 14, 1667.

[4] Clarendon, *Life of Edward, Earl of Clarendon* (Oxford, 1827), III. 456. The palace soon followed the fate of its builder. After brief tenures by Lord Cornbury (Clarendon's

The suggestion that public money received in any connection is being used for private purposes has always been the incomparable battle cry of an opposition. But there was something peculiarly subtle and powerful in the suggestion that *money received from France for Dunkirk* had been appropriated for private uses. For years, it had been a tradition of English foreign policy that (a) Dunkirk should not belong to France, and (b) if it left Spanish hands, it should come to England. The transaction of 1662 mocked both these traditions. There was reason for obloquy being heaped upon the minister whom Englishmen considered responsible for the sale.

Dunkirk was and is no ordinary port. Its strategic location at the opening of the North Sea and its relation to a rich hinterland made it for centuries an object of the most intense jealousy among maritime powers, and to-day its tonnage ranks fifth among French ports.[5]

England's relation to Dunkirk goes back to the early part of the Hundred Years' War when the town twice came into temporary English possession.[6] Until 1384, it was under the count of Flanders, from

son) and the Duke of Ormonde, it was sold in 1674 to Christopher Monk, second Duke of Albemarle. His notorious excesses soon devoured his father's fortune (see Estelle Frances Ward, *Christopher Monk, Duke of Albemarle* [London, 1915]), and "Albemarle House" passed to a syndicate, headed by Sir Thomas Bond, which demolished it, laid out streets, and subdivided the area in modern realtor fashion (Evelyn, June 19, Sept. 18, 1683). By 1683, the ground was level and houses began to appear—slowly, however, in the absence of modern sales methods—on Bond and Albemarle streets, the names alone commemorating the ephemeral and unhappy career of "Clarendon House", or as history better knows it, "Dunkirk House". The fullest accounts are in E. Beresford Chancellor, *Private Palaces* (London, 1908), pp. 67–74, and Robert Wilkinson, *Londina Illustrata* (London, 1819–1825); but the latter, taken partially from Strype, is untrustworthy. See also Echard, *England* (London, 1720), p. 842; Rapin de Thoyras, *England* (London, 1726–1747), II. 616–617; Burnet, *History of His Own Time* (Oxford, 1897), I. 445–446; and Lister, II. 386–389. As late as 1851, two pillars, flanking the entrance to the Three Kings' Livery Stables in Piccadilly, were said to be the sole remains of the house; see Chancellor, p. 74, citing J. W. Archer, *Vestiges of Old London* (London, 1851).

[5] *Statesman's Year-Book*, 1931. See also Aristide M. Guilbert, *Histoire des villes de France* (Paris, 1844–1848), III. 286; J. Cordier, *De la navigation intérieure du départment du Nord et particulièrement des travaux du port de Dunkerque* (Paris, 1828), pp. 1–3; and G. Fernique, *Le port de Dunkerque; son développement et son rôle économique* (Paris, 1913).

[6] P. Faulconnier, *Description historique de Dunkerque* (Bruges, 1730), pp. 24–26. Fernique, p. 12. *Cf.* William Longman, *History of the Life and Times of Edward III.* (London, 1869), I. 156. In addition to the monumental work of Faulconnier, the following briefer histories of the town have been consulted: E. Bouchet, *Histoire populaire de Dunkerque* (Dunkirk, 1871); V. Derode, *Histoire religieuse de la Flandre maritime et en particulier de Dunkerque* (Paris, 1857); H. E. Diot, *Historical Description of Dunkirk, 646–1785* (London, 1794); B. F. de Belidor, *Architecture hydraulique* (Paris, 1737–1753,

whom it passed to the duke of Burgundy. Upon the death of Charles the Bold, it fell to the Austrian Hapsburgs who in 1513 transferred it to the Spanish branch of the family. In 1558, when France took Calais from the English, Dunkirk also fell, but only for a moment. The approach of Egmont compelled the French to retreat, and ten English ships anchored near the shore then assisted in administering a crushing defeat at Gravelines. Thus did Queen Mary help to preserve her husband's Flemish empire after losing her only Continental possession.[7]

During the years that followed, Dunkirk became one of the most valued ports of the Spanish empire, warring almost constantly on the Dutch and doing more damage to their trade than all the rest of the empire. The English Parliament was told in 1601 that "they have done England more hurt since they began than all France".[8] Unfortunately, her privateers did not restrict their activities to enemies—what successful seamen did at that time?—and the resulting piracies soon caused Dunkirk to be known as the "Algiers of the North". Her sea captains developed reputations for dauntless courage and intrepidity, and her early annals are filled with the exploits of the Collaerts and the Jacobsons, worthy forerunners of the great Jean Bart whose statue marks the center of the present city.[9]

In 1625, the Duke of Buckingham proposed to the Dutch a joint attack on Dunkirk. He was undoubtedly thinking less of acquiring

vol. III., bk. I., ch. I., for Un abregé de l'histoire de Dunkerque . . . jusqu'en 1712); and for Mardyck, R. de Bertrand, *Histoire de Mardyck et de la Flandre maritime* (Dunkirk, 1852).

[7] J. A. Froude, *History of England* (London, 1890), VI. 481–482. *Cambridge Modern History*, III. 184.

[8] W. Cobbett, *Parliamentary History* (London, 1806–1820), vol. I., col. 948. For the atrocities of the Dunkirk privateers against the English in the first half of the 17th century, see S. R. Gardiner, *History of England, 1603–1642* (London, 1896), V. 79, 82, 87, 245, 428; VI. 9, 34, 293; VII. 384, 389; also *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Various Collections*, VII. (1914) 81; and *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, under "Dunkirk". The situation naturally got worse after the resumption of the war between Spain and the Netherlands in 1619.

[9] The four reecnt volumes by Henri Malo: *Les corsaires dunkerquois et Jean Bart*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1913–1914) [vol. I. to 1662]; *La grande guerre des corsaires Dunkerque, 1702–1715* (Paris, 1925); *Les derniers corsaires Dunkerque, 1715–1815* (Paris, 1925), constitute a scholarly and definitive study. In 1908, he also edited *Les corsaires: Mémoires et documents inédits* (largely secondary, based on documents); and in 1929, he published a popular *Jean Bart*. There is also much material in Charles de La Roncière's monumental *Histoire de la marine française*, 6 vols. (Paris, 1899–1932); and some in Ernest Van Bruyssel, *Histoire du commerce et de la marine en Belgique* (Brussels, 1861–1865); C. B. Norman, *Corsairs of France* (London, 1887) is readable, and contains interesting statistical appendixes.

Dunkirk than of fighting Spain, but English commerce was at any rate demanding relief from the privateers. The Dutch, however, preferred to fight alone rather than in such uncertain company, and the duke soon found other outlets for his militant energy.[10]

Seven years later, Charles I., with his curiously inverted vision in foreign affairs, tried to get Dunkirk not by fighting against Spain but with Spain, then hard pressed by the Dutch. He would help her in return for Dunkirk. It was probably his plan to act as a sort of protector to keep it from falling to either Holland or France until a separate Belgian state could be established. Spain, considering herself reduced to no such extremities, peremptorily refused the offer.[11]

But if Charles I. bungled negotiations in these years, English policy was at least shaping itself. Dunkirk was to come to England if to anyone, and by no means was it to go to France. Richelieu's successes of 1633 on the upper Rhine appeared to justify this policy; and when France and Holland agreed in February, 1635, to partition the Spanish Netherlands, Dunkirk going to France[12]—the first of those many seventeenth century treaties to partition Spanish territory—Charles's pathway should have been clearly marked: a definite Spanish alliance. The next few years witnessed nothing of the sort, although he did give some desultory aid to Spain in convoying ships and money to Dunkirk, which incidentally placed him in the unenviable rôle of protecting pirates.[13]

[10] Gardiner, V. 325; VI. 35.

[11] *Ibid.*, VII. 211–214. It is worthy of mention that Sir Thomas Roe, one of Charles's ablest diplomats, who favored a Dutch rather than a Spanish alliance, insisted that Dunkirk must never go to France (*ibid.*, p. 347). His letters of 1629–1630, when he was with Gustavus Adolphus, have been edited by Gardiner, *Camden Society Miscellany*, VII. (London, 1875), no. 4; and many more are in *Clarendon State Papers* (Oxford, 1767–1786), I.

[12] J. Dumont, *Corps universel diplomatique* (Amsterdam, 1726–1730), vol. VI., pt. 1, pp. 80–85. Aitzema, *Saken van Staet en Oorlogh* (The H ue, 1669–1672), II. 109, and *passim*. A. Waddington, *La république des Provinces-Unies, la France, et les Pays-Bas espagnols de 1630 à 1650* (Paris, 1895–1897). It was Richelieu's idea to maintain a buffer state between France and the Netherlands, and the treaty stated that if the Belgians rose in rebellion, their state would be established independently, except for certain frontier losses to France and Holland in compensation for their protection (A. de Saint-Leger, *De Flandriæ comitatus primordiis: La Flandre maritime et Dunkerque sous la domination française, 1659–1789*, Paris, 1900, p. 44). This may be regarded as the first plan for a permanently neutralized state of Belgium. See René Dollot, *Origines de la neutralité de la Belgique et le système de la Barrière, 1609–1830* (Paris, 1902); *cf.* Henri Pirenne, *Histoire de Belgique* (Brussels, 1909–1926), V. 15, and Edmond Willequet, *Histoire du système de la Barrière dans les negociations antérieures à la Paix d'Utrecht* (Annales des universités de Belgique, VI. [Brussels, 1847–1848]), pp. 197–200, 363.

[13] Gardiner, VII. 384, 389; VIII. 100, 162. *Clarendon State Papers*, I. 391.

Fortunately for Dunkirk, the new large-scale dynastic war was to busy French armies elsewhere, and not until ten years later could France return to her allocated spoils of 1635.

In 1646, the French, after taking and losing Mardyck the preceding year, besieged Dunkirk with renewed vigor, though without the desired assistance of a jealous Dutch army.[14] The English, torn by civil war, were in no condition to assist Spain in the defense, but there is reason to think that if they had had free hands, Cromwell and the Independents would have continued the earlier policy of supporting Spain. They knew of Queen Henrietta's designs for French and Dutch assistance, and of Charles's negotiations with Portugal, then in rebellion against Spain. But they were thoroughly occupied with Presbyterians and a defeated though dangerous king; and, moreover, Spain was as usual sparing in her offers. It appears that the Marquis de Castel Rodrigo, governor of the Spanish Netherlands, promised to put Dunkirk, Ostend, and Nieuport in English hands, but Madrid never gave official sanction to this offer. Free trade in the West Indies, which would have made London merchants listen, was not even mentioned. Only money was actually offered. Perhaps the Spanish expected to be able to hold out without English aid. In this, they were not entirely wrong; for until France by a court intrigue at The Hague secured the coöperation of Tromp's fleet, there was slight chance of success. Then the end came quickly—October, 1646—and for six years, Dunkirk was in French hands. It is indicative of the value placed upon the town that neither the Spanish in 1646, nor the French in 1652, were willing to transfer it to England to keep it from falling to the other. Rather let it fall to the enemy, each perhaps argued, from whom it might more readily be retaken, than from a friendly ally.

As soon as the Continent recovered somewhat from the shock of Charles I.'s execution, there was immediate rivalry for England's alliance. The Peace of Westphalia had brought no end to the war between France and Spain, which now entered upon an aggravated stage with the defection of Condé and other French nobles to the Spanish side in connection with the War of the Fronde. From 1650 to 1652, Dunkirk figured almost constantly in English diplomacy, either as the object of

[14] Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War* (London, 1897), III. 169–171; Waddington, II. 143–155; Petrus Johannes Blok, *History of the People of the Netherlands* (London, 1898–1912), IV. 126; A. Chéruel, *Histoire de France pendant la minorité de Louis XIV.* (Paris, 1879–1880), II. 225–259; J. Fr. Sarasin, *Histoire du siège de Dunkerque* (1st ed., Paris, 1649), in his *Œuvres* (Paris, 1926), II. 90–145.

an Anglo-Spanish attack,[15] or as England's price for assistance to the French. In September, 1651, Spain finally undertook the siege alone, after refusing to offer England more than Calais, when and if taken. The situation was not unpromising, for the French civil war was at its worst, with Mazarin twice succumbing to temporary exile from court.[16] It appears that more than once during the twelve-months siege, he conceded in principle the cession of Dunkirk in return for English help. But he always drew back from the actual promise. The intricate diplomacy of the winter of 1651–1652, has been thoroughly studied by S. R. Gardiner, A. de Saint-Leger, and L. Lemaire;[17] and they attribute to D'Estrades, the governor of the besieged city, somewhat treasonable conduct, including a secret trip to England later concealed by falsified correspondence.[18] The eminent Jean Jules Jusserand has recently answered these three scholars with considerable pugnacity and patriotic zeal.[19] He denies the treason and the trip to England and forthwith restores D'Estrades "au nombre des honnêtes gens". But his proofs are none too convincing and his opponents, particularly Saint-Leger and Lemaire, who are editing D'Estrades's correspondence for the *Société de l'histoire de France*,[20] and who have written numerous scholarly monographs on his career, must command great respect. The problem is involved, and leads one into a close study of the early eight-

[15] *E.g.*, in February, 1650, the Prince of Orange warned France of this possibility (G. Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives ou correspondance inédite de la maison d'Orange-Nassau*, ser. II. [The Hague, 1858–1862], IV. 352), and, in the following November, Croullé, Mazarin's secret agent in London, sent home similar warnings (Gardiner, *Commonwealth and Protectorate*, [London, 1903] I. 313).

[16] At Brühl, Feb., 1651, to Jan., 1652; and at Sedan, Aug., 1652, to Feb., 1653.

[17] Gardiner, Cromwell and Mazarin in 1652, in *English Historical Review*, XI. (1896) 479–509, summarized in *Commonwealth and Protectorate*, II. 159–166. Lemaire, Dunkerque et la politique de Mazarin, in *Revue du Nord*, VI. (1920) 1–25, and the works referred to in notes 12, 23, 42, and 76. See also A. Chéruel, *Histoire de France sous le ministère de Mazarin* (Paris, 1882), I. 62–68, 178–182, 270–277; I. Goll, Estrades à Dunkerque et à Bordeaux (1652–1654), in *Revue historique*, IV. (1877) 314–326; P. Tamizey de Larroque (ed.), *Relation inédite de la défense de Dunkerque, 1651–52, par le Maréchal d'Estrades* (Paris, 1872), a rare pamphlet of which I have only been able to use some lengthy extracts, printed in the above article by Goll (pp. 318–319).

[18] Particularly D'Estrades's letter of Feb. 5, 1652, from Dunkirk, when he was probably in England. The letter was first printed in 1718, but it existed in D'Estrades's lifetime and was used by Pellisson in compiling his memoirs of Louis XIV. (Ch. Dreyss, ed., Paris, 1860). The trip to England was said to have occurred between Jan. 30 (when D'Estrades was at Montreuil) and Feb. 15, when he sent to Mazarin English proposals that had come to him exactly a month before.

[19] Le maréchal d'Estrades et ses critiques, in *Rev. Hist.*, CLVIII. (1928) 225–252.

[20] *Correspondance authentique de Godefroi, comte d'Estrades, de 1637 à 1660*, vol. I. [to 1646] (Paris, 1924).

eenth century editions of D'Estrades's correspondence.[21] It is possible that D'Estrades simply exceeded his authority in encouragement or promises to Cromwell. He may have feigned treason—with or without instructions—so as not to bind his superiors in case the situation improved and rendered the sacrifice of the city unnecessary. But this is unlikely. Real treason, considering the situation in France at the time, was much more probable. And it should not be taken too seriously. Many good Frenchmen, some with royal blood in their veins—Condé, for example—were traitors at the time. A civil war was on; Mazarin had been in exile for a whole year; and the path of loyalty must have been rather hazy at times. D'Estrades was always heavily in debt: a situation not unfavorable to treason. But since, if treason was perpetrated, Cromwell at least did not accept, the question is a somewhat academic one. Cromwell—not yet Protector but powerful—wanted Dunkirk, but apparently still expected to receive it officially from either France or Spain in return for his alliance. In that case, only one state would have been made an enemy. Had he taken it from D'Estrades by way of treason, both would have had to be faced. His unwarranted expectation can easily be understood when one considers the constancy and persistency with which his help was being sought by all sides. During the winter, he was seen by representatives of Spain (Cardenas), of Condé (Barrière), of the French Huguenots (Cugnac), of Mazarin (Gentillot),[22] of the French government (Choqueux), of D'Estrades (Fitz-James, whom Cromwell had first sent to D'Estrades),[23] and, with

[21] See I. Goll, Recherches critiques sur l'authenticité des ambassades et négociations de M. le Comte d'Estrades, in *Rev. Hist.*, III. (1877) 283–296; IV. 278–326; H. C. Rogge, De diplomatieke Correspondentie van Godefroy d'Estrades, in *Verslagen en Medeleeligen der K. Acad. van Wetenschappen* (1897), *Letterkunde*, IV. pt. 5; and A. de Saint-Leger, Les diverses éditions des lettres, mémoires, et négociations de M. le Comte d'Estrades, et la propagande anti-française dans la première moitié du XVIII[e] siècle, in *Bibliographie moderne*, XXI. (1922–1923) 89–103. From 1672 on, and particularly after 1685, Protestant and liberal Holland was a prolific center for European propaganda against Catholic and intolerant France. "A toutes les périodes de crises depuis 1709 à 1759, on a puisé dans la correspondance de Godefroy d'Estrades tous les arguments que l'on pouvait trouver contre la politique de la France" (*ibid.*, 103).

[22] Gardiner (*Commonwealth and Protectorate*, II. 161), however, considers that Gentillot's mission of December, 1651, was without Mazarin's knowledge as well as against his wishes. He bases this opinion upon Mazarin's statement to D'Estrades in a letter of December 26 (A. Chéruel, *Lettres de Mazarin* [Paris, 1872–1896], IV. 576). For further data and references on these agents, see C. H. Firth and S. C. Lomas, *Notes on the Diplomatic Relations of England and France, 1603–1688* (Oxford, 1906), pp. 39–40.

[23] L. Lemaire, D'Estrades et Fitz-James, in *Bulletin de l'Union Faulconnier*, XIX. (1922) 126. Cromwell had started the negotiations through Fitz-James on his own responsibility (Gardiner, II. 162), but had had to share it with the council of state in January (*ibid.*, p. 99).

the aforesaid question, by D'Estrades himself. It is probable that when in February Cromwell started equipping twenty-five ships under the command of Blake, it was with the expectation of sending them to the defense of Dunkirk upon Mazarin's promise to do two things: to cede the city to England, and to recognize the Commonwealth government.

D'Estrades had said that Dunkirk could not hold out beyond January, but it did, thanks to the smuggling of provisions. Meanwhile Mazarin returned to court (January 30) and was again temporarily master of France. Unfortunately, he appears to have been unduly encouraged to expect English help without conceding either Dunkirk or recognition. In this, he was thoroughly mistaken and discovered it too late. The council of state was not united behind Cromwell. An opposition was being led by Sir Robert Villiers, who had even gone to France to strengthen it. Cromwell had gone far rather single-handed—in April, he sent 4000 foot and 1000 horse to Dover, presumably for the occupation of Dunkirk—and when the question of a French alliance actually came before the council, it was divided between opposition and indifference, and all were chiefly concerned in the gathering clouds of Dutch war, which soon made any French alliance out of the question. Thus Cromwell had to postpone his dream of acquiring Dunkirk until the Dutch were defeated and his power was better established. Meanwhile, Mazarin, sensing Cromwell's difficulties and anxious over the impending surrender of Gravelines, instructed Gentillot on April 21 to go to England and actually promise Dunkirk. But again drawing back from what he considered a supreme sacrifice, he kept his impatient envoy in France three weeks longer while Gravelines fell and England drifted into war with Holland. All possibility of English relief was now gone; and when Dunkirk finally faced surrender in September, Blake's fleet actually aided in the attack. Fifty-four French ships, advancing to the relief of the city, were captured or destroyed by the English fleet. There had been too much miscellaneous piracy for some sort of reprisal not to serve as the published excuse for this surprising conduct; [24] but Blake's deed should undoubtedly be construed as Cromwell's reply to France's persistent unwillingness to cede Dunkirk and to recognize the English government. Mazarin had taken neither the Commonwealth

[24] France charged the Commonwealth with having received 4000 scudi from the Spanish admiral, the Marquis de Leyde, and asked for the return of the captured ships and reparations for those destroyed. The English reply referred to the damages done by French privateers, and Mazarin was too weak to press the case, knowing full well that a war with both Spain and England at that time would be fatal to France. Gardiner, II. 190. J. B. Perkins, *France under Mazarin* (New York, 1886), II. 223.

nor Cromwell with sufficient seriousness. It soon appeared that he had finally learned his lesson.

During England's succeeding five years of negotiations with France and Spain which resulted in alliance with the former, Dunkirk was not forgotten; but with Cromwell's large-scale operations in the Mediterranean and the West Indies, it no longer played quite the rôle that it had previously. Epochal steps in the creation of the British empire were being taken, even if few realized it; and the more imaginative minds were finding substitutes for the once glorious idea of regaining a small remnant of a lost Continental empire. But the London merchants, who were suffering more than ever from the Channel privateers after Cromwell's expedition against the Spanish West Indies, kept before him the urgent necessity of doing something about Dunkirk. Merchantmen, freighters, and fishing boats were being captured within sight of the English shore. One Dunkirk captain, with a flair for humor as well as piracy, told the crew of a captured collier that while the Protector might fetch gold from the West Indies, the Dunkirker would carry the Protector's coals from Newcastle.[25]

As early as 1654, Mazarin offered Dunkirk to Cromwell for his alliance and he apparently never withdrew the offer; but the Protector's indecision, and Stuart and Huguenot complications prevented the alliance until March 13/23, 1657, when Sir William Lockhart and Mazarin came to a full agreement on a joint war against Spain.[26] Dunkirk and Mardyck were to go to England, and Gravelines to France; but if the last fell first, it should go to England until the others were taken. Thereupon in May, 6000 English soldiers under the command of Sir John Reynolds landed in Flanders.[27] In October, they assisted in taking Mardyck, and a few weeks later they repelled a Spanish attack in which both Charles II. and the Duke of York fought on the Spanish side. During the winter, Reynolds was lost on the Goodwin Sands, and serious

[25] *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1655–1656*, p. 200. See further, Gardiner, IV. 241; C. H. Firth, *Last Years of the Protectorate* (London, 1909), I. 42; and Malo, *Corsaires*, I. 423–426. The Venetian ambassador in June, 1656, reported that 187 vessels had been captured by Dunkirkers since the outbreak of hostilities, and that the latter had landed troops in Cornwall and were plundering the country, probably a mere rumor. *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, XXX. (London, 1930), 228, 236.

[26] Gardiner, II. 432, 441; III. 113–136, 154–166; IV. 185–190, 242–246; Firth, *Last Years of the Protectorate*, I. 268–301; and Chéruel, vol. III., chs. I., II.

[27] The treaty stipulated that there were to be no Irish or Scots. Their loyalty would be questioned. C. H. Firth, Royalist and Cromwellian Armies in Flanders, 1657–1662, in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, XVII. (London, 1903) 76. F. P. G. Guizot, *Cromwell and the English Commonwealth* (London, 1854), II. 331–332, 481.

misunderstandings arose with Turenne and the French; [28] but in March, a new treaty was evolved by the competent Lockhart,[29] who then doffed his diplomat's garb for military uniform and led the English force at the Battle of the Dunes (June 14, 1658). Eleven days later, Dunkirk was captured.[30] Louis XIV. immediately entered the city, and in accordance with the treaties, turned the keys over to Lockhart the same day.[31] Thus did England come into possession of her long-sought goal.

The French soldiers were said to have been furious at the spectacle of seeing a former possession regained, with bloodshed, only to be given to the English the same day; and for several weeks it required all of Lockhart's and Mazarin's soothing tact to prevent trouble between the armies. "If the cardinall did not moderate and brydle the humours of the French", wrote Lockhart on July 27 after a month of disputes, quarrels, and suspicions, "I am confident we should have been by the ears ere now". Louis XIV., of course, put on his most gracious front, accompanied the transfer with the usual pomp, gifts, and a gorgeous embassy; but he probably felt it was unjust.[32] Mazarin's plentiful enemies, lay and clerical, had been using the English alliance as a point of attack. The latter found its Protestant aspect an especially fine target. Cardinal de Retz, jealous and ever ready to capitalize on Mazarin's subordination of religious to political ends, published a powerful pamphlet [33]

[28] Firth, *Last Years of the Protectorate*, II. 176–179, 203–204. Thurloe, *State Papers* (London, 1742), VII. 21, 24, 70.

[29] Chéruel, III. 132. *Clarendon State Papers*, III. 394. Thurloe, VII. 2.

[30] See Firth, *op. cit.*, n. 27, pp. 67–89, and *Last Years of the Protectorate*, vol. II., ch. XV.; and J. W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army* (London, 1899–1927), I. 266–274. Lockhart's account of the battle is in Thurloe, VII. 155. In 1675, General Thomas Morgan wrote an egotistical account of the campaign, which was printed in 1699 under the title, *A True and Just Relation*, etc. It has been frequently reprinted (*Harleian Miscellany, Somers Tracts, Stuart Tracts*) and is quoted from freely in S. A. Swaine, English Acquisition and Loss of Dunkirk, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, I. (London, 1883), 93–118. It is obviously biased and its historical value is "very doubtful". See C. H. Firth in the *Academy*, XLV. (1894) 149; and W. C. Abbott, *Bibliography of Oliver Cromwell* (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), no. 1230.

[31] The frequently printed letter (*e.g.*, *Gentleman's Magazine*, XXXIV. [1764] 444) of Cromwell to Mazarin making dire threats if Dunkirk were not surrendered to Lockhart at once, was an eighteenth century concoction. It undoubtedly grew out of previous difficulties between Lockhart and Mazarin regarding the cession and the conduct of the campaign. A. de Saint-Leger in his L'acquisition de Dunkerque et de Mardyck par Louis XIV. (see n. 76) states that the transfer occurred "on the morrow".

[32] Thurloe, VII. 279; see also pp. 174, 187; and Firth, *Last Years of the Protectorate*, II. 201–203. Guizot, II. 337. Chéruel, *Lettres de Mazarin*, VIII. 440. The embassy was that of the Duc de Créquy (Firth and Lomas, p. 41).

[33] *Très humble et très importante remonstrance au roi sur la remise des places maritimes de Flandre entre les mains des Anglois.* It is printed in De Retz's *Mémoires* (Col-

late in 1657 which had much to do with almost wrecking the alliance during the winter. But Mazarin, cool, collected, and purposeful, with his eyes on the complete defeat of Spain as a prelude to greater things than the mere recovery of Dunkirk, withstood the attacks, fought pamphlet with pamphlet,[34] and courageously carried through and defended the terms of the alliance. Following Cromwell's death, he saw more possibility of regaining Dunkirk; and during the crisis of May, 1659, his ambassador to England, Bordeaux, suggested its purchase by France in order to relieve English financial stringency,[35] already freely confessed the preceding autumn by Richard's and Lockhart's requests for a French subsidy.[36] But Bordeaux was referred to Lockhart as the one in authority there and later reported that the latter would not consider selling. There is no authority for the persistent rumors that Mazarin planned to retake it by force.[37]

As for the English, they were not in a state of mind to get enthusiastic over anything in 1658, least of all a matter of foreign policy. In fact, from 1625 to 1688, England was essentially devoted to things domestic; and except for a few farseeing souls, Cromwell's brilliant foreign policy did not call forth more than the ordinary feeling of national satisfaction

lection des grands écrivains de la France, Paris, 1870–1896, V. 291–327; and is quoted at length in Jules Bourelly, *Cromwell et Mazarin* (Paris, 1886), pp. 64–71. It appeared in many editions and translations, including a Spanish edition published after the Battle of the Dunes, which was prefaced by a fictitious Anglo-Spanish treaty of alliance of May, 1657, and an English edition of June, 1659, bearing the title, *France no Friend to England*. It was published anonymously but is generally attributed to De Retz without question. See discussion in his *Mémoires*, V. 167–169, 275–291. For some curious reason, it is omitted from C. Moreau, *Bibliographie des Mazarinades* (Paris, 1850–1851), which lists among its 4311 libels against Mazarin, 35 beginning with *Très humble remonstrance*, but none of 1658 or 1659.

[34] Most important among the pamphlets written in defense of Mazarin was one by Abel Servien, marquis de Sablé, entitled *Remarques sur la reddition de Dunkerque* (Paris, 1658). It is analyzed at length in Bourelly, pp. 258–263. See also De Retz, *Mémoires*, V. 284; and Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 3083. For Mazarin's comments on his opponents, see Chéruel, *Lettres de Mazarin*, IX. 27, *passim*.

[35] Bordeaux to Mazarin, May 1, 1659, in F. P. G. Guizot, *History of Richard Cromwell and the Restoration* (London, 1856), I. 369. Bordeaux had frequently mentioned the English attitude regarding Dunkirk (Feb. 5, 6; Mar. 6, 10, 31; Apr. 10). On March 6, he stated that interest in it had declined, owing particularly to the expense involved, and he thought it could be bought. But he advised waiting until Richard and his Parliament were embroiled when it might be secured more cheaply (*ibid.*, p. 313).

[36] Bordeaux to Mazarin, Sept. 15, 1658, *ibid.*, I. 231; Mazarin to Bordeaux, Oct. 31, 1658, *ibid.*, II. 449; Mazarin to Lockhart, Sept. 22, 1658, Chéruel, *Lettres de Mazarin*, IX. 66. See also *Nicholas Papers* [Sir Edward] (London, 1886–1920), IV. 111, 141.

[37] Edward, Earl of Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England* (Oxford, 1888), VI. 199. Chéruel, *op. cit.*, n. 19, III. 292–295. Bourelly, p. 261.

over a battle won. But to the Protector, Thurloe, and Lockhart, the acquisition of Dunkirk was a great victory for an aggressive, commercial, Protestant England. "It is not only an excellent outworke for the defence of England", wrote Lockhart, "but a sally-port, by which his highness may advantagiously sally foorth upon his enemies." It would serve as a check, when necessary, on Spain, Holland, or France;[38] and it would end the depredations of the Flemish corsairs. It meant greater influence for England among Continental Protestants, and closer commercial contacts with Central Europe. None seemed to see the disadvantages, so prominent in the minds of recent historians, of the resumption of a Continental possession. Lockhart early made it clear that the expense of a garrison and of the maintenance and extension of necessary fortifications would be large; but it was to be worthwhile. The country around Dunkirk was poor, yielding little; but Lockhart expected to acquire more, and at Cromwell's death he was negotiating with Mazarin for Ostend.[39] He served as governor of the city as well as ambassador to France until the Restoration; and as in most of his activities during a varied career, he served well—well enough to deserve a biographer.[40]

[38] Thurloe, VI. 853 (Mar. 7/17, 1658). See also Firth, *Last Years of the Protectorate*, II. 218; and S. von Bischoffshausen, *Die Politik des Protectors Oliver Cromwell in der Auffassung und Thätigkeit seines Ministers des Staatsecretärs John Thurloe* (Innsbruck, 1899), pp. 205, 207, quoting from Thurloe's Summary of Foreign Relations, 1660, which is included as an appendix (pp. 187–224), and which is also printed in somewhat different versions in Thurloe, I. 759–763, and *Somers Tracts* (London, 1809–1815), VI. 329–336. It was written by Thurloe at the order of, and for the information of, the Restoration government.

[39] Firth, II. 217. Thurloe, VII. 279. Bischoffshausen, pp. 208–209 (from Thurloe's Summary). Vicomte de Grouchy in an article, L'annexion de Dunkerque à la France, *Revue générale*, XXXVI. (1882) 711–721, states without mention of authority that the sale of Dunkirk to France was discussed during Cromwell's lifetime and that an agreement was almost reached, the English asking 1,500,000 livres, not counting munitions and artillery. I have found no other mention of this, and doubt its correctness. Rather does it appear that Cromwell was interested in concerting measures with France for further Continental conquests (Thurloe, I. 762; VI. 478). In the biased pamphlet *France no Friend to England* (see n. 33) is the statement that England "doth only consider them [Dunkirk and Mardyck] as the first step or degree upon which they will hereafter mount up the bastions of Callis [Calais]" (p. 10). *Cf.* similar suggestions regarding his Baltic aspirations in Slingsby Bethel, *World's Mistake in Oliver Cromwell* (1668).

[40] On Lockhart, see *Dict. Nat. Biog.*; Firth, II. 207–216; Walter Frewen Lord, *Lost Possessions of England* (London, 1898), pp. 31–32; John Hill Burton, *Scot Abroad* (Edinburgh, 1864), II. 230–249; Thomas Carlyle, *Life and Letters of Cromwell* (ed. by S. C. Lomas, London, 1904), III. 138–139. There is a brief sympathetic summary of his career by R. M. Lockhart in the *Westminster Review*, CXLVIII. (1897) 150–158. James Waylen, *House of Cromwell and the Story of Dunkirk* (London, 1891), pp. 232–249, is hopelessly unhistorical in its laudation of Lockhart, as is Mark Noble, *Memoirs of the Protec-*

We obtain most of our information on the period of the English occupation from the aforementioned Flemish historian Pierre Faulconnier (whose father was *grand-bailli* of the town in 1662), the correspondence and reports of the English governors and their lieutenants,[41] and the letters of Père Canaye, Mazarin's Jesuit agent there.[42] The last had no official title, but was sent to protect the Catholic inhabitants against Cromwell's Puritan soldiers as well as against the Flemish clergy who were Spanish in sympathy. Known to Lockhart, he was scarcely a spy even though in constant correspondence with Mazarin. His presence did, however, symbolize a sort of continued French protection not without significance.

England's new acquisition was a well-fortified town of about 5000 inhabitants. An interesting census of 1659 reported 1060 adult males, 1621 adult females, and 2419 children.[43] There were eleven chirurgeons, one doctor, nine apothecaries, four lawyers, nine merchants, seven notables, and one executioner. Forty-two taverns ministered to the people's needs. As government, secular and spiritual, there were thirty-two officials, fifty-nine priests and monks, and fifty-three nuns. Of guilds, there were twenty-five from that of the fishermen, which was the largest with 102 members, to that of the brewers, the smallest, with nine members.

The English garrison was composed of from two to three regiments, totaling from 3000 to 5000 men. Immediately after the taking of the

torate-House of Cromwell (Birmingham, 1784), II. 255–261, from which Waylen's account is largely taken. It need scarcely be stated that Cromwell showed keen political sense in selecting a Scotsman to represent him in France when one considers the traditional tie between those two countries. *Cf. Gentleman's Magazine,* XII. (1742) 357.

[41] Mostly in the *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic,* and Thurloe. *Cf.* n. 60.

[42] Edited by L. Lemaire for La Commission historique du Nord as *Dunkerque sous la domination anglaise: Correspondance de Mazarin et du père Canaye* (Lille, 1924) [hereafter referred to as Lemaire]. Canaye was born in 1594 and served as army chaplain, professor of humanities at Paris and Clermont, and rector at Moulins and Blois. At Clermont, he had for a pupil M. de Saint-Evremonde; see Conversation du maréchal d'Hocquincourt avec le père Canaye in Saint-Evremonde, *Œuvres* (Amsterdam, 1726), II. 183–197. His works are listed in C. Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la compagnie de Jésus* (Liége, 1869–1876). He remained at Dunkirk most of the time until banished by Harley in August, 1660. In June, 1661, the new governor, Lord Rutherford, was asked to readmit him but he refused, referring to him as "too turbulent a spirit" (*Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1661–1662,* pp. 10, 14). J. Crétineau-Joly, *Histoire de la compagnie de Jésus* (Paris, 1845–1846), IV. 272, incorrectly states that he was mentioned in the treaty as "rerum Catholicarum moderator".

[43] Thurloe, VII. 701–702; *cf.* Canaye's statement (Lemaire, p. 8) that there were under 4000 in 1658. Regarding the state of the walls and forts, see *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1658–1659,* pp. 67–68, 96; and Thurloe, VII. 713.

city, Lockhart allocated troops to the completion of Turenne's brilliant campaign, and in the autumn they returned with victories but also with sick and wounded to be cared for. Since the Spanish barracks would house only a part of the garrison, the remainder had to be quartered in homes.[44] Assignments were made, however, by the city magistrates, and there is no record of violence and disorder. But Lockhart had no money with which to pay the soldiers. Honest and efficient Alderman Backwell had been appointed paymaster and treasurer of the garrison,[45] but considering the state of the finances at Cromwell's death, it is easy to understand why money was not always forthcoming. As winter came on, danger of mutiny was increased by the lack of cots, blankets, and provisions. Requests for shipments went unheeded by the distraught interim government of Richard, which had appealed in vain for a French subsidy. Finally, in early December, Lockhart went to England and got what he needed; and the immediate danger was past.[46] Two months later, he was in England on a similar mission, and it appears that in his absence the danger of mutiny was so great that he hurried a message to the Dunkirk magistrates, asking them to advance £7000 pending his return. They apparently actually raised £6550; but to forestall the reader's enthusiasm over the splendid coöperation of the city authorities, it must be added that the eleven subscribers were all magistrates whose tenures of office had been renewed by Lockhart just a few weeks before.[47] The situation remained unsatisfactory until the summer of 1659 when a

[44] Early in July, Bergues, Furnes, and Dixmude were taken. On August 27, Gravelines fell; on September 9, Audenarde, and on September 25, Ypres. See Pirenne, V. 13; and Fortescue, *British Army*, I. 274. *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1659–1660*, pp. 150–152. Thurloe, VII. 248.

[45] See F. G. Hilton Price, Some Account of the Business of Alderman Edward Backwell, in *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society*, VI. (1890) 191–230; R. D. Richards, A Pre-Bank of England English Banker—Edward Backwell, in *Economic Journal, Economic History Series*, no. 3 (1928), pp. 335–355; and *Dict. Nat. Biog.* Among Backwell's ledgers, now in the hands of Glyn, Mills, and Company (successors, since the amalgamation of 1923 to Messrs. Child, a bank directly descended from that of Sir Francis Child [d. 1713], whose daughter was the wife of Backwell's grandson), is a rough account book entitled Copies of Dunkirke Affair. It contains chiefly papers relating to his work as paymaster of the garrison.

[46] See n. 41; and Lockhart to Thurloe, Nov. 8, 1658, in Thurloe, VII. 466. On the preceding day, there had been a small mutiny or riot, resulting in the pillaging of shops until mounted soldiers cleared the streets. Four men were court-martialed. For the English reaction to this incident, see *Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow* (Oxford, 1894), II. 96. *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1658–1659*, p. 219. Reports of mutiny had also given rise to rumors that it had been retaken by the Spanish, *Clarke Papers* (London, 1891–1901), IV. 207.

[47] Lemaire, pp. 15–18, 60–61. In May, 1659, £7000 was again borrowed of the town magistrates, Thurloe, VII. 668.

parliamentary commission was sent to investigate and report.[48] Thereafter, with England under a military régime, the soldiers were paid more regularly and at the same rate as troops in England. Food and clothing were better supplied and threats of mutiny were seldom heard during the remainder of the English occupation.

The religious situation might easily have made much trouble. Lockhart and Cromwell had given firm promises not to interfere with Catholic worship,[49] and they appear to have been faithful to these promises, in spite of their Protestant zeal and the problem of disciplining victorious Ironsides in a Catholic town rich in ecclesiastical treasure. The Puritan soldier who lighted his pipe at an altar candle was probably an exception who served nobly as publicity for the irreconcilables.[50] But as usual, there were political complications to religious differences, and when on August 6, Lockhart called upon all magistrates, priests, and heads of religious houses to take an oath of allegiance, the *curé,* Jacques van der Cruyce, and others were absent. The clergy requested permission as usual not to have to reveal the secrets of the confessional, and to this Lockhart agreed; but he refused to put it on paper.[51] Some clergy accepted this; others did not, among them the *curé;* and there the matter rested for a while. But in the late autumn with unpaid soldiers, suffering, and threats of mutiny about him, and faced with the necessity of going to England to secure help, Lockhart decided to settle the matter and leave no open disloyalty behind. On November 26, Van der Cruyce was called to the Hotel de Ville and in the presence of "le corps échevinal", refused to take the oath. Then Lockhart took him out to dinner and got along no better there. The governor can at least hardly be blamed for impulsiveness and lack of patience. The *curé* was then sent to Bergues, and his vicar, Louis van Woestwinckel, was appointed in his place to remain until 1661. Van der Cruyce later regretted his

[48] Composed of Colonel Ashfield, Colonel Packer, and Lieutenant Colonel Pearson, *ibid.,* 712–719. Their report includes an interesting Account of the Public Revenues of Dunkirk. There had been another minor mutiny just before their arrival, *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1658–1659,* pp. 390–391.

[49] Cromwell to Mazarin, July 1, 1658, in Lemaire, pp. 32–33. For Lockhart's special agreement, see *ibid.,* p. 6 (also in Faulconnier, II. 36). *Cf.* Derode, pp. 212–214. Religious processions were, however, prohibited. Immediately after the Restoration there was a petition to permit them again (*Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1660–1661,* p. 80), which was granted one year later (*Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1661–1662,* p. 10).

[50] Canaye to Mazarin, Aug. 3, 1658, in Lemaire, pp. 36–38. On the English "atrocities", see *Abbé* Flahault, Notice sur le couvent des Carmes déchaussés de Dunkerque, in *Annales du Comité flamand,* XX. (1892) 261, 325–326.

[51] See "Resolutio patrum recollectorum" of Sept. 19, 1658, and other documents in Lemaire, pp. 42–45.

stand and asked to be allowed to return, but in vain. Not until France had resumed control in December, 1662, was he reinstated.[52]

During Charles II.'s brief possession of Dunkirk, he permitted the establishment of a convent of English nuns—the next to the last (1682) established there prior to the French Revolution.[53] During their exile, Charles and James had been aided at times by Mary Knatchbull, abbess of the English convent at Ghent.[54] Following his restoration, it appears that the king wrote her a letter, expressing thanks and vague promises of future compensation. On the advice of her bishop and friends who perhaps realized the number and questionable value of such promises, she proceeded to attempt to realize on hers by going to England where she had a successful audience with the king on October 31, 1661.[55] In addition to a pension, she was granted her principal request: the right to establish an English convent at Dunkirk. The following May, about a dozen members of the Ghent convent journeyed thither and were well received, according to the king's instructions. A house was purchased, a church was built, and Mary Caryll (who had accompanied the abbess to Whitehall) assumed control, first as prioress, later as abbess.[56] It is interesting to note that before many months had passed, Charles—by that time husband of a Catholic wife whose presence and *entourage* were

[52] Relation de ce quy s'est passé en la maison de ville devant le magistrat et son excellence l'ambassadeur Lockhart et M. le Pasteur de la ville de Dunkerque, 26 Nov. 1658, printed in Lemaire, pp. 46–47. It was said to have been written by the *curé* himself, and sent to Mazarin by Canaye on December 2. See also *ibid.*, pp. 14, 31, n., and 48. Immediately following Charles II.'s restoration, Father Florentine Blommaert, Guardian of the Recollects, and two priests petitioned for his return but without results (*Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1660–1661*, p. 80).

[53] Derode, pp. 296–297. Faulconnier, p. 44. Lemaire, p. 29. *Gallia Christiana* (Paris, 1870–1899), vol. V., col. 347. A. Bonvarlet, Notes et documents pour servir à l'histoire des maisons religieuses et hospitalières de la Flandre maritime, in *Annales du Comité flamand*, XVII. (1888) 154–159 (French translations of English manuscripts from the Pontoise convent, which was another recent [1658] offshoot of the Ghent establishment).

[54] Probably one of the eleven daughters of Sir Norton Knatchbull, Biblical scholar, and M.P. for New Romney (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). His son, Sir John, wrote a narrative of James II.'s first attempt at flight in 1688 (Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 32095, 33923), printed in *Notes and Queries*, 3d ser., VI. (1864) 1–3, 21–23. There is a letter of Mary Knatchbull to James II., Mar. 3, 1685, in Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 21483, f. 21. Two of her letters to Nicholas in 1658 and 1659 are in the *Nicholas Papers*, IV. 46–47, 77–78.

[55] W. D. Macray, *Notes which passed at Meetings of the Privy Council* (London, 1896), no. 43.

[56] Sister of John Caryll, titular Lord Caryll, diplomatist, poet, and secretary to Mary of Modena from 1686 until his death (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). Some of his correspondence and papers are in Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 28224–28226.

arousing suspicions—saw fit to lie out of the above episode in order to allay anti-Catholic fears.[57]

Meanwhile, Lockhart provided for his own religionists. At first, an improvised place for worship and a temporary Flemish minister, who had been ministering to a few Protestants at night, were secured.[58] He then wrote to England for a regular pastor, stressing the need of a man of power and learning, whereupon the ubiquitous Hugh Peters was sent. He proceeded to be his usual busybody, doing everything besides preaching, and Lockhart saw to it that after a few trial sermons, he secured no "call".[59] Later incumbents were more successful, thanks undoubtedly to the governor's tactful guidance of the selection.

Meanwhile, Lockhart repaired the fortifications and undertook extensive new works.[60] And all was done with enthusiasm on his part, for he believed in Dunkirk. He had spent years in striving for it, first as diplomatist, and then as military commander. He had withstood large offers to betray his trust, and he was to continue to do so. In May, 1659, as England seemed headed toward anarchy, and as royalist plans for the summer uprising were maturing, the Earl of Middleton, an old comrade-in-arms, approached him with large offers for the surrender of the city to Charles.[61] Now Lockhart was not a man of strong constitutional

[57] *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1661–1662*, pp. 488, 499 (Nicholas to Rutherford, Sept. 14, 29, 1662). *Cf.* Bonvarlet, p. 160, n. 53.

[58] Leopold von Ranke, *History of England principally in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1875), III. 201–202. In the autumn of 1660, H. de Vic complained of the "want of good orthodox ministers, there being not one in that place but is a whining puritanicall tubb preacher at most" (*Nicholas Papers*, IV. 254–255). Regarding Patrick Forbes, a later minister, see *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1660–1661*, p. 228.

[59] Lockhart to Thurloe, July 8/18, 1658, in Thurloe, VII. 249, *passim*. Lockhart undoubtedly handled this difficult fellow with no small tact. "Mr. Peeters hath taken leave at least 3 or 4 tymes; but still something falls out, which hinders his return to England. . . . He returns loaden with ane account of all things heare, and hath undertaken every man's businesse. I must give him that testimony, that he gave us three or four very honest sermons; and if it were possible to gett him to mynd preaching, and to forbear the trubling of himself with other things, he would certainly proove a very fitt minister for soldiers. . . . He hath often insinuated to me his desyer to stay heare, if he had a call. Some of the officers also have been with me to that purpose; but I have shifted him so handsomely, as, I hope, he will not be displeased; for I have told him, that the greatest service he can doe us is to goe to England, and carry on his propositions, and to own us in all our other interests, which he hath undertaken with much zeale" (*ibid.*).

[60] See the report from Dunkirk of Colonel Alsopp to General Fleetwood, May 6, 1659, in Thurloe, VII. 668–669; and the report of the English commissioners at Dunkirk to the council of state, August, 1659, in *ibid.*, p. 694. Judging from these two reports, much work was done during the intervening period. See also the letter of Colonel Lillingston and Colonel Alsopp to the council of state, June 23, 1659, in *Clarke Papers*, IV. 281–283.

[61] Clarendon, *Rebellion*, VI. 198–199, referring to letters of Middleton to Clarendon,

prejudices. He had, during his lifetime, served both Stuart and Cromwell; and he was again to serve the Stuarts. But he never lacked a keen sense of loyalty. Following Richard's abdication, he was puzzled over the situation and uncertain of his own tenure. He therefore went to England, offered to resign his post but begged them not to give up the city. He was thereupon newly commissioned as governor and ambassador, and returned to reject absolutely all royalist advances. Much of the next six months was spent in Paris and in southern France, watching the progress of Mazarin and Luis de Haro in their negotiation of the Peace of the Pyrenees, and particularly guarding against the former's recognition of Charles Stuart, who was also near at hand. In November he was, like most others, puzzled over Monk's motives and hoped to be able to penetrate them by a trip to London.[62] The result was complete satisfaction over Monk's loyalty to the Commonwealth, and he therefore continued to reject all royalist overtures for entrance to Dunkirk.[63] But with the parliamentary action of the next April, the garrison was soon drinking the new king's health, and on May 8, it expressed its loyalty to him in a formal address to Monk, to which Lockhart interposed no objection. He then hurried to Breda to attempt to repair his error of judgment,[64] but there was naturally little chance of his succeeding. He had refused to coöperate in the restoration, and he was both a relative (by marriage) and an appointee of the late Protector. His recall was immediate upon Charles's landing at Dover; but he was not further humiliated or molested; and after ten years of comparative inactivity, he was to return to diplomatic service.

His successor, Edward Harley, whose son was to make history in Queen Anne's reign, was a stanch Presbyterian who had fought first on the side of Parliament, and then with Charles I. Elected to the Parliament of 1656, he was excluded by Cromwell and signed the remonstrance against him. In the spring of 1660 as a member of the council of state, he met the king at Dover, and on Monk's recommenda-

June 2, 20, 1659, in the Clarendon MSS. at the Bodleian Library. *Cf.* Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs* (Oxford, 1853), IV. 333; and *Nicholas Papers*, IV. 111, 141.

[62] He called on Sir Henry Vane on November 14, Ludlow, II. 171. *Cf.* Burnet, I. 155; and Lemaire, pp. 17–18.

[63] See Bordeaux's correspondence with Mazarin in Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, II. 265–450; and *Nicholas Papers*, IV. 189–190 (from Brit. Mus., Egerton, 2542. *Cf.* Clarendon, *Rebellion*, VI. 199; Burnet, I. 155–156; Burton, *Scot Abroad*, II. 244; Lord, *Lost Possessions*, pp. 31–32; and David Hume, *England* (New York, 1879), V. 513.

[64] Pepys, Apr. 1, 1660. Bordeaux to Mazarin, May 17, 1660, Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, II. 426.

tion was at once appointed governor of Dunkirk.[65] His tenure was brief, less than a year; and during the latter half, his brother Robert served in his place much of the time as vice governor.[66] In general, he continued Lockhart's policies, rebuilding and enlarging the fortifications, and strenuously supporting the prerogatives of the place against French and Spanish encroachments.[67] Like Lockhart, he believed in Dunkirk, opposed the idea of selling it, and in May, 1661, just as England and France were agreeing on the Portuguese marriage, he was dismissed to make way for one with no such scruples.[68] He was an example of the better sort of moderate that rallied to the restored monarchy in 1660, but soon found official position incompatible with morality and high principle. He had refused a baronetcy in 1660 for fear it would be construed as a bribe, and his knighthood was conferred in his absence and without his knowledge. In contrast, his successor got a barony before going, and an earldom upon his return. Had Charles II. retained and been worthy of servants like Harley, the history of the Restoration would have been different.[69]

[65] See A. Collins, *Historical Collections of the Noble Families* (London, 1752), pp. 200–205; *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 3d ser., XII. (1866) 204; Lord, *Lost Possessions;* p. 33; and *Dict. Nat. Biog.* On May 31, 1660, the House of Commons granted Harley leave of absence "in Regard to his publick Employment in his Majesty's Service as Governor of Dunkirke, which he is now attending" (*Commons' Journals*, VIII. 52). His formal commission was dated July 14 (*Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1660–1661*, p. 140). See also Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, II. 428, 437; *Hist. MSS. Com., Portland MSS.*, III. (1894) 222; and Firth, *op. cit.*, n. 27, p. 96.

[66] Lemaire, pp. 22–23. He was also colonel of Lockhart's regiment of horse. The two brothers are frequently confused.

[67] One must not take too seriously Schomberg's statement to him in 1688 " 'that the French had often during his [Harley's] time attempted to take it by surprise' " (quoted in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*); but in recommending Harley for the post, Monk appears to have had in mind probable French designs and wanted a strong governor, thoroughly above suspicion. Collins, *Collections*, p. 203; *cf.* Lord Lansdowne, "Vindication of General Monk", in his *Works* (London, 1736), II. 141.

[68] May 22, 1661. A letter of Harley to his son, dated March 19, 1699/1700 (printed in Lady Brilliana Harley's *Letters* [London, 1854], p. 245), in explanation of some statements about the sale of Dunkirk which, he heard, would soon appear in Clarendon's printed memoirs, implies that Harley's Presbyterianism was the real cause of his dismissal. The king was reported to have said that he was "continually disturbed because [Harley] is represented to be a notorious presbyterian". It is worth noting that the ultra-Anglican Long Parliament had just come into being on May 8.

[69] I am not ignorant of the fact that this same Harley took money from the French ambassador, Barillon, in connection with the parliamentary intrigues of 1678–1679 (see the writer's, Louis XIV.'s Financial Relations with Charles II. and the English Parliament, in the *Journal of Modern History*, I. [1929] 199, *passim*). But I would point to that fact as a commentary on the depraving tendencies of the reign, rather than a cause for retracting a statement on Harley's (at least one-time) personal integrity and worth.

Andrew Rutherford was one of the many Scottish soldiers of fortune who entered Continental service during the Thirty Years' War.[70] He attained the rank of lieutenant colonel in the French army, and it was upon the recommendation of Louis XIV. that he was appointed to Harley's post. He thereupon received from the same king a lieutenant-generalship (dated two years back, thereby conferring a comfortable bribe in terms of back salary) and a special pension of one year "sur les menus plaisirs du Roi". He has been described as one devoid of fear and other useful qualities. He was so French that in his first letter to Secretary Nicholas, he begged pardon for his poor English, "being more accustomed to the French tongue".[71] Harley's attempts to collect old taxes and impositions from neighboring towns had called forth a French protest just about the time of his dismissal. Charles II. apologized, declared Harley did not understand that certain orders were merely traditional, and not for enforcement, and said that Rutherford "would better know how to live with his neighbors".[72] The Anglo-French *entente* was already in being.

But there were still difficulties ahead. Ecclesiastically, the path was somewhat smoothed by Rutherford's coming. A policy more favorable to Catholics was adopted, and processions were again permitted. York's regiment, which was largely Catholic, had been brought to Dunkirk in April. During the summer England and France worked hand in hand against the Flemish (Spanish) clergy in defeating the hopes of Stuart d'Aubigny to become bishop of Dunkirk. But, politically, trouble continued. In July, Louis XIV. asserted his right as "seigneur foncier" of the city, which would permit him to select magistrates. His claim frankly admitted that the treaties of 1657 and 1658 had been silent on the point, but he hoped there would be no trouble in recognizing the continuation of this ancient feudal privilege which had at least never been revoked.[73]

We come now to the sale.

[70] *Dict. Nat. Biog.* Jean de Boislisle, *Mémoriaux du conseil de 1661* (Societé de l'histoire de France, Paris, 1905–1907), I. 131, 138, n. Marquis d'Étampes, French ambassador in London, profited from the English civil war in recruiting 6000 Scotsmen in 1642 for the French wars (Lemaire, p. 24).

[71] Lord, *Lost Possessions*, p. 35. *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1661–1662*, p. 4.

[72] *Clarendon State Papers*, vol. III., suppl., p. viii (Clarendon to Bastide, May 9, 1661), and see further pp. vii, xi-xii. There is much information about commercial difficulties with Spain and France in *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1660–1661, e.g.*, p. 351, and *1661–1662*.

[73] Lemaire, pp. 25, 26, 27. *Cal. St. Ps., Dom., 1661–1662*, pp. 10, 139. Boislisle, I. 242, n. Claude Cochin, La tentative de Stuart d'Aubigny, in *Bulletin du Comité flamand*, Oct. 1, 1908.

It is probable that in the spring of 1661 when negotiating the Portuguese marriage treaty, Charles II. and Clarendon decided it would be well to dispose of Dunkirk. Supporting this opinion is the appointment of Rutherford, and Charles's actual suggestion of the sale to D'Estrades in July, 1661.[74] But there is no assurance on this point, and one might conclude against it from the fact that when D'Estrades manifested no interest, the subject was dropped for nearly a year. It is probable that the failure of Portugal in May, 1662, to deliver as much dowry as promised[75] had something to do with Clarendon's letter of June 29, which reopened the question.

No lengthy and subtle analysis of various possibilities is necessary in order to state the reasons for the sale, and the originators of the idea. It was caused primarily by the need for ready cash, and it was furthered by Charles II.'s desire to live at peace with Louis XIV. The originators were those most responsible for the king's financial obligations: Charles himself, the chancellor, and the treasurer.

The story of the negotiations from June to November, 1662, has been frequently told,[76] and need only be sketched here. On June 7/17, D'Estrades, having been French ambassador to England but in Paris since April, was instructed to go to Holland as ambassador. A month

[74] D'Estrades to Louis XIV., July 21, 1661, in Archives des Affaires étrangères, Angleterre, 75, ff. 69–72. *Cf.* Lemaire, p. 11; and Boislisle, II. 319–328 (from Arch. Aff. Étr., France, 412, ff. 60–62). On the relation of the sale and the marriage, see W. Kennett, *Register and Chronicle* (London, 1728), p. 770; Echard, p. 84; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.*, V. (1876) 203; Julian S. Corbett, *England in the Mediterranean*, II. 12–14; and Anderson's introduction to *Journal of Edward Montagu, First Earl of Sandwich*, Publications of the Navy Records Society, LXIV. (1929) xxx-xxxi. Regarding rumors in the spring of 1662, see Lemaire, p. 14 (citing D'Estrades to Louis, Jan. 20), and Louis to D'Estrades, Mar. 4, 1662, in D'Estrades, *Lettres, mémoires, et négociations* (London, 1743), I. 266.

[75] See the writer's Anglo-Portuguese Marriage of 1662, in *Hispanic American Historical Review*, X. (1930) 349.

[76] Particularly, A. de Saint-Leger, L'acquisition de Dunkerque et de Mardyck par Louis XIV., in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, II. (1900) 233–245, which is an expansion of a part of his doctoral dissertation, cited in n. 12. The more important documents on the subject have been printed by L. Lemaire in *Bulletin de l'Union Faulconnier*, XXI. (1924) 1–223. This work, entitled Le rachat de Dunkerque par Louis XIV., contains 142 letters, dependably edited from French archives. This can be said of no other collection of D'Estrades's correspondence except his *Correspondance authentique . . . de 1637 à 1660*, edited by A. de Saint-Leger and Lemaire for the Société de l'histoire de France, of which only vol. I. (to 1646) has appeared. Two other monographs on the subject by Vicomte de Grouchy and S. W. Swaine, cited in notes 39 and 30, are of minor importance. The former provides the usual narrative with a strong Gallic accent and some inaccuracies. The latter devotes one small paragraph to the sale after twenty pages on the campaign of 1658, in which he quotes at great length from printed materials, some of which are of questionable value.

later, however, he was still in Paris, suffering from an infected dog bite. Thereupon arrived Richard Bellings with the aforesaid letter from Clarendon, urging him to come to London on a matter of importance; and on July 16/26, Louis XIV. empowered D'Estrades to go and to buy Dunkirk. The trip was to be somewhat secret, and merely incidental to his Dutch embassy. He was to leave for Holland, and at Calais receive a letter from England, which, it would be explained, made it advisable for him to include London in his itinerary.

He arrived on August 2/12. After forty-eight hours in bed, owing to his wound and a rough crossing, he held his first interview with the king and Clarendon. During the next three weeks, there were frequent conferences, with York, Southampton, Albemarle, and Sandwich also present. Meanwhile the English price dropped from twelve to five million livres, and the French offer rose from two to four million livres. There they stopped, a million apart; and D'Estrades finally asked for a ship for Holland. But he did not go, his wound—now probably a sort of diplomatic wound—serving as an excuse. Both sides were using all the arts of Levantine bargainers, but neither could make full use of the best weapon—a long hold-out—because of disconcerting rumors as to what was going on. The enlargment of the English conference committee, as well as opposition therein, prevented the desired secrecy. Louis XIV. therefore decided to meet the English figure, if the stores and ammunition were included; and that was accepted. But delay ensued in regard to the terms, for Charles demanded all cash, and Louis would offer only two millions in cash. How Colbert finally found a Parisian banker to discount Louis's later notes at twelve per cent., and make possible the immediate payment of 4,654,000 livres is related by the writer elsewhere.[77] All was hastened by the growing opposition among the treaty commissioners, the members of the privy council, and the merchants of the city. On November 18/28, D'Estrades took possession of the city, and four days later Louis XIV. was received with much poetry and great rejoicing.

This is the only such territorial alienation in British history, and various have been the judgments upon it. Until Clarendon's fall in 1667, his opponents found it a good point of attack and utilized it to full advantage. During the next seventy-five years, Whig historians were cleverer and more loquacious than their Tory opponents, and the opinion that the sale was a mistake became fairly well established in eighteenth century minds. The desire to keep Gibraltar created arguments show-

[77] The Dunkirk Money, 1662, in *Journal of Modern History*, V. 1–18.

ing the folly of selling Dunkirk.[78] Moderation was not a mark of eighteenth century political pamphlets, and what soundness of argument there was on the Tory side received scant attention. But recently, criticism has gone far to the other extreme. Sir Julian Corbett's statement is typical of many. "Of all wise actions, few perhaps have been more mercilessly misrepresented than the sale of Dunkirk."[79] From this premise, Corbett's sturdy imagination affirms that the transaction was planned and approved by a committee of financial, military, and naval experts (Southampton, Albemarle, and Sandwich), who presented it to Clarendon and the king. To the latter (and to Corbett) it appeared as a grand design concocted by the noblest minds of both Restoration and Commonwealth: "Two were the most sober of the Stuart councillors, and two the most moderate of Cromwell's men-at-arms." This is convincing—except for the documents, which show that the experts mentioned were either opposed to the sale or indifferently favorable and that Clarendon really stood alone with the king and York in favor of it.[80]

In discussing whether or not it was best to sell Dunkirk in 1662, historians may certainly disregard the question of the propriety of England possessing it now. On the latter point, there would undoubtedly be little disagreement. But on the former point, the writer disagrees with the late Sir Julian and many other recent writers. Charles II. has not received very fair treatment from historians, but his suddenly arisen legion of new champions command questionable respect, however sympathetic one would like to be. Their cases will not be strengthened by including the sale of Dunkirk among Charles II.'s statesmanlike measures. It was a great mistake and for three reasons.

First, it outraged a national tradition for the sake of temporary financial gain. It has been stated that one of the traditions of English

[78] In 1728 the Reverend Edward Combe printed some of the correspondence relating to the sale (*The Sale of Dunkirk*, London) with the express purpose of showing that it was an error of policy not to be duplicated in the case of Gibraltar. *Cf.* the work by Amhurst, cited in n. 89.

[79] Corbett, pp. 12–14. *Cf.* similar statements or suggestions by Lord, *Lost Possessions*, p. 35; R. Lodge, *History of England, 1660–1702* (London, 1910), pp. 22–23. But on the other side see Swaine, p. 115, and A. T. Mahan, *Influence of Sea Power* (London, 1896), p. 105 ("inexcusable from the maritime point of view").

[80] On October 27, D'Estrades wrote: "Le chancelier est celui de tous qui a en le plus à souffrir pendant les contestations, qui ont été formées par tout le conseil sur cette affaire. Les commissaires [Albemarle, Sandwich, and Southampton] sont ceux qui ont le plus travaille à le rompre et l'on peut dire le Roi d'Angleterre et M. le Duc d'York en auroient été ebranlez, s'il n'avoit pris soin de les maintenir dans des premières résolutions" (Lemaire, p. 134). Clarendon naturally tells a different story (*Life*, II. 243 ff.).

foreign policy was that if Dunkirk left Spanish hands, it should come to England; and that it should never go to France. Its acquisition by Cromwell in 1658 appeared to be the beginning of a revived Continental empire, and as such it inspired some much needed confidence. The England of 1658–1662, craving most of all domestic peace and quiet, was in no frame of mind to display much exultation or resentment over an incident of empire; but in the usual small group whose ideals live on through such post bellum periods, there actually was exultation in 1658, and resentment in 1662.

Secondly, Dunkirk was won just four years before in a hard fought campaign which cost 5000 English lives. Even if it were to be regarded as a white elephant, suitable only for disposal, a regard for moral values should have dictated its retention for some years until the memories of 1658 should have dulled a little.

Thirdly, Dunkirk had long been a pirate nest, levying increasingly heavy toll upon English shipping. In French hands, it was to become that again—a fount of pirates in peace time, and of privateers in war time. Previous history should not have left England unforewarned of this future; and it was naturally to be worse than ever before because of the growth of English commerce. There was to be more to prey upon.

There is no denying that England was poor in 1662, and found the upkeep of Dunkirk expensive. There is also no denying that there were some international difficulties to be smoothed if Dunkirk were retained. It (along with Jamaica) stood in the way of peace with Spain; for the Peace of the Pyrenees had been silent on both points. In other words, England had received Dunkirk merely from France, to whom Spain said it never belonged. Mention has also been made of points of difference with Louis XIV. in regard to his feudal rights at Dunkirk. Transferring it to France would rid England of both these complications, and an expensive possession; and it would bring in ready cash for expenses at hand as well as for pressing debts.

But statesmanship should have seen how hollow and temporary were all these advantages. Only a part of the Spanish difficulty would be settled, for Jamaica remained. But Jamaica and Dunkirk put together did not constitute a genuine peril, for Spain was in no condition to fight anybody over anything. French respect for England—and respect is the basis of solid friendship between nations as well as individuals—would have been greater if England possessed Dunkirk than if not. England's temporary poverty is less to the point than her potentialities; and these she possessed in plenitude, as witness the two Dutch wars, and her

recovery from the Fire and the Plague. Moreover, the sale surely did not accomplish the financial rehabilitation of either the king or state. The cash received was as usual only a temporary relief. The saving in cost of maintenance[81] was of more importance, but where did it go? Into Tangier. And after twenty years of costly maladministration, Tangier was not ever sold but merely relinquished.

Why then has the sale recently come to be considered such a statesmanlike step on the part of Charles II.? Because he foresaw how inconvenient it would be to have it now? Charles II. foresaw very little—not nearly so much as his good brains would have permitted him to had he used them more. Was it because its possession by England would have involved her in Continental wars? But in just what wars would England, possessing Dunkirk, have been involved which she otherwise escaped? Or did the sale prevent wars *in toto?* Possibly, but not probably. England's continued possession of Dunkirk for a century or more would have done less to cause war than to increase the value of her alliance in war. There would have been other advantages. English confidence in the Restoration government would have been shaken by one less thing; English commerce would not have suffered so outrageously in succeeding years from the depredations of the Dunkirk corsairs; Louis XIV., against whom nearly all Europe was soon aligned, would have had one less base of operations against the Spanish Netherlands; and English prestige on the Continent might never have sunk so low as it did during the last ten years of the Restoration period.

We come now to the final chapter: England's regret and discomfiture, followed by a long series of attempts, naval, military, and diplomatic, either to retake the city, or if it must remain in hostile hands, to render it harmless. All, in the finality, failed.

The value of the city to Louis XIV. is well indicated by his expenditures thereon. From 1672 to 1680, Vauban and 30,000 men constructed forts, basins, jetties, and canals on a plan which the great military architect of the age called "le plus beau et le plus grand dessein de fortifications du monde".[82] By 1688, it was one of the most prized and best fortified port-citadels of France. And in that year began the Second

[81] Probably over £100,000 a year. See various estimates and figures in Lister, *Clarendon*, II. 22, and III. 510; Burnet, I. 303; Faulconnier, II. 54; and Cobbett, IV. 266.

[82] E. Lavisse, *Histoire de France* (Paris, 1901–1911), vol. VII., pt. II., p. 253. See further, regarding Dunkirk from 1662 to 1700, Bouchet, pp. 278–404. Ézéchiel Spanheim, in his *Relation de la cour de France en 1690* (Société de l'histoire de France, Paris, 1882, p. 301) calls it "de tous les ports de France . . . peut-être le plus remarquable pour les prodigieux ouvrages qu'on y a faits".

Hundred Years' War. Long before that, England had realized more than ever the mistake of 1662. During the negotiations attending the sale, Louis XIV. had sought to reassure London merchants by promising to publish an ordinance against piracy. Instead, he republished a map of Dunkirk, dated 1646, the legend of which offered the comforting assurance that piracies *had* ceased. Within four years of the sale, England was at war with France, and Dunkirk privateers were active. The next year, the youthful and intrepid Jean Bart was at sea, and continued to be most of the time until his death in 1702. English losses in that period were enormous. In 1689, English and Dutch craft, captured by the French corsairs, mostly from Dunkirk, totalled 4200; [83] and many were the occasions when Parliament listened to such tirades as this of 1678: "We shall never be quiet till Dunkirk be out of his [French] hands, in the very mouth of the Thames, a new Algiers set up in Christendom; the midway betwixt your great rendezvous, Northward and Westward, of all your Navigation".[84] It is interesting, if not important, that most of the Jacobite expeditions from the Continent assembled and sailed from Dunkirk; and it was there that the Old Pretender delayed the expedition of 1708 by the homely business of having the measles.

In 1694, English and Dutch fleets assaulted the great fortress, but in vain. They could do no better the next year.[85] Vauban had done his work well. But in 1712, with France worn and tired, diplomacy achieved partial results where arms had failed. During the armistice attending the negotiation of the Treaty of Utrecht (July, 1712–April, 1713), Dunkirk was placed in English hands as a mark of good faith.[86] There was varied opinion as to what to do with it, but the majority was undoubtedly satisfied by Article IX. of the treaty, according to which Louis XIV.

[83] Malo, *Corsaires dunkerquois*, I. 430. Norman, *Corsairs*, p. 21. During forty years of warfare between 1656 and 1783, 4344 prizes were sold in the admiralty courts at Dunkirk for a total of £6,327,000. In the peaceful year, 1751, 251 English prizes were carried into Dunkirk.

[84] Anchitell Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons* (London, 1769), V. 308.

[85] Wm. Laird Clowes, *Royal Navy* (Boston, 1897–1903), II. 477–478, 482. Faulconnier, II. 104–108.

[86] *Cambridge Modern History*, V. 440. Throughout the negotiations, Dunkirk was the subject of many pamphlets, particularly Richard Steele, *Importance of Dunkirk considered in Defence of the Guardian of August 17, in a Letter to the Bailiff of Stockbridge* (3 editions, London, 1713), and Jonathan Swift's reply, *Importance of the Guardian considered, in a Second Letter to the Bailiff of Stockbridge* (London, 1713). John Toland wrote *Dunkirk or Dover; or the Queen's Honour, the Nation's Safety, the Liberties of Europe, and the Peace of the World, All at Stake till that Fort and Port be totally Demolish'd by the French* (London, 1713), in which he stated: "We may as soon let the French fortify Dover, as keep up the fortifications of Dunkirk" (p. 32).

promised "to level the fortifications of Dunkirk, to block up the port, and to demolish the sluices which scour the harbour, with this further condition that such fortifications, port, and sluices shall never be reconstructed".[87] Under the direction of the youthful and efficient Major Hill, these terms were immediately executed. Thereupon, Louis XIV. started a harbor at Mardyck, and a canal connecting it with Dunkirk. These works were being pushed rapidly with 12,000 men engaged, so it was reported, until English protests caused them to cease. A little later, the regent's desire to curry favor with England made it advisable to demolish these renewed works.[88] Throughout the reign of Louis XV. treaties between England and France (1717, 1748, and 1763) continued to include the "Dunkirk clause" of the Treaty of Utrecht.[89] The limitations imposed were partially but not entirely successful, for there were some new fortifications to destroy each time. By 1783, the futility of such attempts to repair past mistakes became apparent when the Peace of Paris abrogated all Dunkirk clauses and left the city free to prepare the great works, financed by Calonne and his borrowed gold, against the siege of 1793. In August of that year, while Carnot was achieving the most remarkable piece of military organization the world had ever seen, a befuddled war office in Downing Street, more ready to furnish siege plans drawn up by lord chancellors than to consult and supply generals and admirals, allowed the Duke of York to sacrifice 10,000 lives before retiring discomfited.[90] Dunkirk was a part of France, and was to remain such—even with English help when, from 1914 to 1918, British soldiers fought to keep it French.

CLYDE L. GROSE.

Northwestern University.

[87] Henri Vast, *Les grands traités du règne de Louis XIV.* (Paris, 1893–1899), III. 76.

[88] *Cambridge Modern History,* VI. 442.

[89] *Ibid.,* VI. 249, 331, 339–340, 345–346, 429, 436. See also *The Case of Dunkirk faithfully stated and impartially considered* (London, 1730), which reviews the French failure to comply fully with the terms of 1713, and Nicholas Amhurst, *The Danverian History of the Affairs of Europe . . . with the Present State of Gibraltar . . . also of Dunkirk* (London, 1732). Amhurst was the editor of the famous *Craftsman,* the most successful of all the political journals of the age; and under the pseudonym "Caleb D'Anvers of Gray's Inn" he had frequently attacked Walpole and his easy-going policy in regard to Dunkirk.

[90] Fortescue, *British Army,* vol. IV., pt. I., pp. 123–133. Camille Lévi has printed most of the documents relating to the siege in his Dunkerque avant le siège, and Après le siège de Dunkerque en 1793, in Société dunkerquoise pour l'encouragement des sciences: *Mémoires,* XLIX. (1909) 243–282; L. (1910) 285–424. He also wrote La garnison de Dunkerque de 1662 à 1870, *ibid.,* XLIV. (1906) 5–82, which concerns chiefly 1793.

THE DEPRESSION OF 1819–1822, A SOCIAL HISTORY

In 1819, the United States, in common with all Europe, experienced a severe shock to its economic and social well-being. Not only was there a general and drastic decline in property values, but fully as significant were the radical changes in social mood and outlook which found expression in widespread agitation and, finally, in political action. Perhaps even more than in indexes of prices and bank clearings the history of a people is reflected in the alternating moods of buoyant expansiveness and earth-bound depression. In this early precedent are illustrated all the major features of what has become a recurring phenomenon of American social and economic history.

There was, in the first place, the preceding period of extravagant speculation and apparent prosperity. The long cycle of wars, both in Europe and America, ending only in 1815, had favored the erection of an unstable and overdeveloped structure of credits and debits. Every type of economic activity had flourished, including industry, which grew into the proportions of a boom after 1808, under the stimulus of an exclusive home market. Upon the financial façade, in particular, was lavished all the aspiration of a people who were projecting an accidental and temporary good fortune into the indefinite future. The close of the war cycle brought only a momentary lull in the strong breeze of prosperity. It shifted rather than abated its course. While the new industry felt the chill air of British competition, both commerce and agriculture continued to prosper, and the expansion of banking went on with uninterrupted vigor. The prevailing condition was admirably described in the report of a committee of the Pennsylvania legislature, prepared in 1820.[1]

> The plenty of money, as it was called, was so profuse, that the managers of the Banks were fearful that they could not find a demand for all they could fabricate, and it was no infrequent occurrence to hear solicitations urged to individuals to become borrowers, under promises of indulgences the most tempting.

[1] William M. Gouge, *A Short History of Paper Money and Banking in the United States* (Philadelphia, 1833), p. 66. For the current bank expansion, see W. G. Sumner, *A History of Banking in the United States* (New York, 896), p. 74; John Austin Stevens, *Albert Gallatin* (Boston, 1884), pp. 267, 270. On the prosperity generally, J. Leander Bishop, *A History of American Manufactures* (Philadelphia, 1868), II. 235, 244; John Bach McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States* (New York, 1911), IV. 321, 344, 484.

The few warnings and protests went largely unheeded, and even Niles, the shrewdest observer and reporter of the times, quickly changed to a note of optimism. In 1817 he was able to detect signs of returning normality.[2]

> We are settling down better than was hoped for. . . . Let us go on then, . . . the trial of war and the trial of peace have passed. It remains that we . . . march steadily on to the high destinies that await our country.

The really great trial, however, was still ahead. It was precipitated by a sharp crisis in the affairs of the second Bank of the United States. Established in 1816, it had not fulfilled its intended purpose of checking the current bank inflation. The center of a large and spectacular speculation in its own stock, it had indeed added to the inflation. In August, 1818, the Bank management decided upon a policy of contraction. The resulting pressure upon specie brought about a suspension of payments in many places and by many banks. An outcry against the Bank led to a congressional investigation which turned up evidence both of mismanagement and dishonesty. There was a movement to repeal its charter, and several lean years followed.[3]

The collapse of the financial façade was the signal for, rather than the entire cause of, the rapid spread of distress and the mental attitudes characteristic of depression. Business bankruptcies multiplied; prices fell; unemployment increased. A mood of complaint and rebellious protest grew upon the American community, and legislatures became the arena of what might be described as depression politics. Calhoun was greatly impressed with its seriousness in discussing the situation with John Quincy Adams in 1820:

> There has been within these two years an immense revolution of fortunes in every part of the Union; enormous numbers of persons utterly ruined; multitudes in deep distress; and a general mass of disaffection to the government, not concentrated in any particular direction, but ready to seize upon any event and looking out anywhere for a leader. . . .

That leadership was subsequently found in Andrew Jackson.[4] Similar Cassandra-like predictions of impending doom had begun early, and Niles in particular made himself both the prophet and the historian of

[2] *Niles' Register*, Apr. 13, Aug. 16, 1816; Mar. 15, 1817.

[3] *Ibid.*, Nov. 23, 1816; Nov. 29, 1817; Gouge, pp. 86, 93 ff., 102; Ralph C. H. Catterall, *The Second Bank of the United States* (Chicago, 1903), pp. 30, 73, 91.

[4] *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, Charles Francis Adams, ed. (Philadelphia, 1875), V. 128 f.; Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Rise of the New West* (New York, 1906), p. 148.

the depression. Already in April, 1816, he had warned that if only "half of the evil that is anticipated by intelligent gentlemen be felt, we shall have 'such times' as the present generation has never seen".[5]

The prophecy came true, even if allowance is made for a note of exaggeration in the current accounts of the hard times.[6] But exaggeration is itself an earmark of depression and a product of its pervasive pessimism. In 1819 Mathew Carey estimated that three million people, approximately one-third of the population, were directly affected.[7] From far-away Cincinnati came a report describing the "distress as beyond conception. Marshall and Sheriff Sales are almost daily".[8] Western New York, where the Erie Canal, even then in process of construction, held out the promise of future prosperity, was, nevertheless, in deep despair. At the annual meeting of the Genesee Agricultural Society, in October, 1820, at Batavia, its president, Samuel Hopkins, proclaimed himself an "alarmist". "My first wish would be . . . to speak in a tone that should rouse the tenants of every log-house in these counties, and make them stand aghast at the prospect of families naked—children freezing in the winter's storm—and the fathers without coats or shoes to enable them to perform the necessary labours of the inclement season." With wheat at thirty-seven and a half cents a bushel, and flour selling for $2.19 a barrel at New York, conditions were "without a parallel".

> Last year we talked of the difficulties of paying for our lands; this year the question is, how to exist. The struggle is not now for property; from this time onwards we shall have to contend for clothing, and a few other necessaries, without which we must become a miserable, and, I fear, a barbarous people. . . . There can be no industry without a motive: and it appears to me there is great danger that our people will soon limit their exertions to the raising of food for their families . . . there cannot be much ambition or hope; education will decay, and the decencies of social life be neglected. . . .[9]

In city and country the distress was equally acute. Unemployment was widespread, and pauperism an urban problem commanding serious attention for the first time in American history. At Philadelphia, an investigating committee named at a general meeting in August, 1819,

[5] *Niles' Register*, Apr. 13, 1816.

[6] The charge of exaggeration was leveled against the protectionists in particular, on the ground that they had an axe to grind. *Cf. The American* (New York, Sept. 1, 1819).

[7] M. Carey, Address to the Farmers of the United States, in *Essays in Political Economy* (Philadelphia, 1822), p. 417.

[8] Letter printed in the Rochester *Telegraph*, Oct. 3, 1820.

[9] Carey, p. 419.

reported that in thirty industries, studied in detail, employment had decreased from 9672 in 1816 to 2137 in 1819; weekly wages were down from $58,000 to $12,000. The total reduction in employment could not be less than 11,592. Niles was able to add up a total of 50,000 as either unemployed or irregularly employed in the three cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore alone. Baltimore had lost 10,000 people since 1815, and he was afraid that the "distress of the people has reached an alarming extent, and there is no considerate man in our large cities and towns that looks to the approaching winter, without anticipating scenes of misery such as he never before witnessed".[10] James Flint estimated that half a million people were unemployed in the country as a whole.[11] From Lexington, Kentucky, the report came to the *Carolina Centinel* that mechanics were without work and that factories representing a capital of half a million dollars were idle. In this section, wrote a correspondent to the same journal: "A deeper gloom hangs over us than was ever witnessed by the oldest man. The last war was sunshine, compared with these times. . . . It is not my business to disguise the facts. . . . The present season requires plain, manly, unsophisticated truth." The *Centinel* also printed the account of a John Daely of Poughkeepsie, New York, who pleaded guilty to the charge of stealing a horse, giving as his reason:

> The Times were so hard he could get no work, and could hit upon no other plan so ready and certain to provide him with a home and steady employment. He is a strong healthy young man; and was to his great gratification sentenced to the state prison for eight years.[12]

Relief for the unemployed and the urban poor was an urgent necessity. Baltimore provided no less than twelve soup stations for its poor during 1820. At Philadelphia also daily distribution of soup took place at the rate of a pint to a person. At New York soup houses were established through the generosity of the butchers, and collections were raised in the city's churches. In 1819 the New York Society for the Prevention of Pauperism was alarmed at the growing numbers of paupers, estimating them at 8000, in a city of 120,000; in the following year it reported that between 12,000 and 13,000 were receiving poor relief. From Cincinnati Flint wrote that many were leaving for the backwoods to raise

[10] *Niles' Register*, Aug. 7, Sept. 4, Oct. 23, 1819; Sept. 16, 1820. *Cf.* also Carey, The New Olive Branch, *op. cit.*, p. 319; McMaster, IV. 532.

[11] James Flint, *Letters from America* (Edinburgh, 1822), letter of Aug. 15, 1820, p. 248.

[12] *Carolina Centinel*, June 12, Nov. 20, 1820.

food, while the newspapers were appealing for old clothes for the poor and for shoes to enable poor children to attend Sunday school.[13] Both at Philadelphia and at New York newly organized societies made studies of the growth of pauperism, analyzing causes and proposing remedies. The sad example of the English poor law was invoked as a warning. Nevertheless, self-sufficing individualism was in need of a prop, and it was partly supplied in the form of a recipe brought from Liverpool for a "cheap, wholesome, and savoury food", which could be made from a pound of rice and mutton suet gravy at a cost of three pence for a family of six.[14]

The propertied classes also suffered great hardships in this period of depression. Property values declined sharply along with earning capacity; added to this was the burden of old debts which could be liquidated only by means of forced sheriff's sales, and this depressed prices still further. A committee of the Pennsylvania senate reported that during 1819 there were 14,537 actions for debt in the state; not counting those for smaller amounts before justices of the peace. In Philadelphia County alone there were 1808 commitments to prison for debt. The value of real and personal property in New York State, as recorded at the comptroller's office, declined from 315 million dollars in 1818 to 256 millions in 1820. In Pennsylvania, land which had been boomed to $150 an acre in 1815 dropped to $35 in 1819.[15] At Baltimore rents declined from forty to fifty per cent., and a third of the property was held by the banks; Niles was sickened "to the heart to see the lists of persons who are published weekly in the Baltimore papers, as making application for the benefit of the insolvent laws of Maryland".[16]

Similar conditions prevailed east, west, and south. At Richmond, Virginia, property depreciated from a half to three-fourths, and half of it was mortgaged to the banks. At Alexandria, a wharf and storehouses which had cost $17,000 brought only $1250 at auction in 1820; at Augusta, Georgia, cotton, for which an offer of twenty-four cents a pound had

[13] Flint, pp. 202, 211; Carey, pp. 319, 431; Rochester *Telegraph*, Mar. 7, 1820; Second and fourth annual reports of the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism (New York, 1820 and 1821); McMaster, IV. 349, 535; Thomas W. Griffiths, *Annals of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1833), p. 231; James Grant Wilson, *Memorial History of the City of New York* (New York, 1893), III. 307.

[14] *The American*, Oct. 2, 13, 1819; McMaster, IV. 526 ff. *Cf.* also the first five reports of the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism (1820–1822), *passim*.

[15] *Niles' Register*, Feb. 24, 1821; Carey, p. 321; Murray Shipley Wildman, *Money Inflation in the United States* (New York, 1905), p. 90.

[16] *Niles' Register*, June 26, 1819.

been refused, could not fetch fifteen. In Massachusetts commercial capital was reported to have taken a loss of twenty-five per cent. during 1819, while the volume of revenue bonds for which the government had entered suits against the debtor merchants increased from less than two million dollars to more than three millions in the course of the year. This was one-fifth of all the bonds outstanding. In the South the Bank of the United States finally took a loss of over two million dollars on bad debts; in the West its losses were smaller because it was able to hold on until values recovered. In the meantime, it owned every kind of property, as Senator Benton of Missouri put it:

> I know towns, yea, cities . . . where this bank already appears as an engrossing proprietor. All the flourishing cities of the West are mortgaged to this money power. . . . They are in the jaws of the monster! A lump of butter in the mouth of a dog! One gulp, one swallow, and all is gone![17]

European creditors lost 100 million dollars through the operation of American insolvency laws, and this, Niles dryly concluded, was our chief profit on the booming trade of the last five years.[18]

John Quincy Adams believed that the low point had been reached at the close of 1820, but a sluggish condition persisted for several years thereafter. As late as August, 1822, while "dashing failures" were no longer taking place, there were still enough "to serve us for half a century. Conditions are such that almost everybody is wondering how other people live." In Boston failures were still numerous in 1822, one hundred occurring during May, June, and July, to an amount exceeding three million dollars, while 3500 persons were imprisoned for debt between 1820 and 1822. Kentucky was compelled to adopt a new stay law for debts in 1821, since the first one had expired and the process of foreclosure was threatening to begin all over again. By 1821 prices were in a complete state of collapse; corn was at ten cents a bushel at Cincinnati; wheat was less than twenty-five cents, and whisky could not sell at fifteen cents a gallon.[19] The banks, to be sure, were crammed with money; government bonds were at a ten per cent. premium, while even the stock of the Bank of the United States had regained lost ground and was back to 119, although paying only five per cent. Niles noted and

[17] *Ibid.*, May 8, 1819; Apr. 22, June 24, 1820; Richmond *Enquirer*, June 1, 1819; Adam Hodgson, *Remarks during a Journey through North America* (New York, 1823), pp. 37 ff. *Cf.* also *Abridgment of the Debates of Congress* (New York, 1860), VI. 622; Catterall, p. 67.

[18] *Niles' Register*, Sept. 16, 1820.

[19] *Ibid.*, Apr. 7, 1821; Jan. 5, Aug. 3, Nov. 2, 1822; Adams, *Memoirs*, V. 409; McMaster, IV. 547; Wildman, p. 99.

deplored the rise of "a system of speculation (we might call it gambling)", which bade fair to equal the stockjobbing at London, and for which idle capital was to blame. He marveled at the paradoxical situation, but argued that the timidity of capital must be overcome and people put back to work. Any other "scheme to relieve the general distress must be mischievous".[20]

The prolonged years of distress naturally provoked a large amount of thinking and even more writing both to explain and to account for the depression. Often the exposition was linked up with a favorite measure of relief, and one was, therefore, intended to justify the other. The prevailing distress was, for example, a boon to the comparatively young protectionist movement, and its sponsors almost reveled in the opportunity to agitate and to forward their particular cause. Other explanations came from moralizing philsophers, who were not so much incorrect as they were vague and obvious; certainly what may have been fresh and new then has since become banal and trite, with endless repetition. All of them, however, belong in the pattern of thought which is characteristic of a period of depression.

A practical man of affairs like Stephen Girard, the greatest private banker of his day, was brief and obvious in attributing the calamity partly "to the great facilities which our Company Chartered Banks have afforded to several of our merchants, traders, and mechanics, who with their fictitious capital have acted imprudently".[21] Everybody blamed the banks, of course, but the exact nature of their offense was best described by an anonymous writer in the *Carolina Centinel,* who incidentally displayed an excellent understanding of banking theory for that early date. Banks should lend only "for a short time to real capitalists". They should lend only part of the necessary capital, such as may be used for immediate needs:

> But instead of this minimum, our numerous banks have sometimes stretched their loans to the utmost . . . . They have created accommodation paper, to enable one man to buy real estate; another to build houses and to buy furniture; a third to buy whole crops of tobacco and flour . . . a fourth to purchase the fixed capital of large manufactories . . . . We wanted to take short cuts to fortune. . . .

Shrewdly also, this writer, justly calling himself Economicus, pointed to causes even deeper than improper banking practice. There had been

[20] *Niles' Register,* Aug. 26, 1820; Mar. 17, June 2, 9, 1821.

[21] John Bach McMaster, *The Life and Times of Stephen Girard* (Philadelphia, 1918), II. 356.

a long war, which "adds to the debt, not to the wealth of a nation". Not only the war, but also the peace which followed had led to large-scale borrowing—three hundred million francs by France for indemnities, great sums by Prussia, Russia, Austria, and Sweden for their military establishments. The English manufacturers had overreached themselves, and our trade also had been expanded with the aid of loans. According to Niles these had amounted to 172 million dollars in five years. To all this there was a necessary limit and termination.[22]

Others also saw clearly that the past wars were the ultimate cause of the present difficulty. As a people we "had fattened upon the distresses of Europe. So easy was money to be obtained that many, very many of us, had anticipated years of growth. . . . We have grasped at the emoluments of futurity, calculating upon a promulgation of the miseries of the old world as a sure guarantee of the prosperity of the new. . . ." [23]

Such speculations bordered very closely on, and, in fact, generally passed over into the moral; on this theme many changes were rung. Few particulars were specified, but the spirit of extravagance, imported from Europe, received general arraignment, and the call was sounded to return to the simpler ways of our ancestors. Industry and frugality, words weighted with revolutionary authority, were given fresh currency. A series of essays on Domestic Economy, under the pseudonym of Howard, appeared in the *National Advocate* at this time, and were widely reprinted in the country press. They dwelt on the vices of the day, attacked that "unincorporated fraternity" of shavers and brokers in Wall Street, and harked back to the better ways of a simpler generation, when ladies did not buy cashmere shawls at $1100, Leghorn hats at $70, nor did they spend fifty dollars on cake for a single party.[24] The Society of Tammany sponsored a public *Address,* in which the recent state of the nation was described as that of "the overgrown and pampered youth . . . vaulting and bounding to ruin". The present visitation was regarded as "the Act of Providence to arrest our hasty strides to national destruction". One after another, it impeached the principal evils, among them, that spirit for speculation which derived "from this factitious and preternatural accession of money . . . ." It called to account the brokers

[22] *The Carolina Centinel,* June 12, 1819; *Niles' Register,* Apr. 23, 1821.

[23] Rochester *Telegraph,* Dec. 1, 1818. *Cf.* also Albany *Gazette,* July 12, 1819; Oliver Wolcott, *Remarks on the Present State of the Currency, Credit, and National Industry* (New York, 1820), pp. 4 ff.

[24] *Niles' Register,* Oct. 26, 1816; Jan. 31, 1818; Wolcott, p. 36; *National Advocate* (New York), Nov. 7, Dec. 14, 1818; Jan. 27, 1819.

"who have fastened upon society like leeches, who eat out its substance and live upon its distresses . . ."; in particular it condemned "the general propensity for shows and public exhibitions, which absorb the time and money, steal on the credulity, and give a wrong turn to the morals of the people".[25]

Not only had past prosperity been demoralizing, but the present distresses were liable to have a similar effect. The alarm was sounded by a director of the Bank of the United States in a letter which received circulation in both the English and the American press. Bankruptcies were so numerous as to "take away the odium . . . and the barriers of honesty are broken down by a perpetual legislation suited to the condition of insolvent debtors . . . . Credit is become very rare . . . . Besides our commercial distresses we are suffering great alarm in this city from incendiaries . . . . Mail robberies and piracies are quite the order of the day. . . ."[26]

Among the banks one in particular was offered up for sacrifice. The Bank of the United States had been investigated and found wanting; its very efforts at reconstruction produced additional hardships and, to the debtors at least, seemed inopportune, if not criminal. Hence even Niles, who otherwise favored the program of thorough purgation and opposed radical measures of debtor relief, lent himself to the attack upon this symbol of oppression. He defended the right and obligation of the various states to tax it out of existence if necessary. He was even prepared to accuse the Bank of bringing on the present distress deliberately in order to compel Congress to act in its favor by creating a new national currency.[27] With the tide of indignation rising high against the Bank, any defense was of little avail, although ably presented by John Serjeant in Congress. He could point out reasonably enough that all speculation was alike, equally good or bad:

> The variety is infinite, and in no country greater than in this. Everything about us invites to speculation . . . . Not an axe sounds in the forest, without adding to the sum of national wealth. I should like, then, to know, in what the discrimination consists, which makes one kind of speculation offensive, and another innocent, if both are permitted by law . . . . What is

[25] *Address of the Society of Tammany . . . to its Absent Members* (New York, 1819), pp. 6 ff.

[26] Reprinted in Gouge, pp. 122 ff.

[27] *Niles' Register*, Mar. 7, 14, 1818; *cf.* especially the series of articles on the Paper System, appearing in the *Register* during 1818; also Dec. 5, 1818. *Cf.* John Randolph's warning, issued in 1816, against "this grand mammoth, which is set up to worship in this Christian land". Gouge, p. 81.

the difference between speculating in land, and speculating in merchandise, or the stocks? [28]

While the banks offered themselves as a ready symbol for the double purpose of explanation and accusation, others looked elsewhere for the true causes. Mathew Carey believed that the symptom was being mistaken for the cause; it was as if a patient were to be accused of eating a horse, because a horse collar was found in his bed. The banking evil was exaggerated; the real difficulty was the unbalanced state of our foreign trade, which in turn was the outgrowth of an unbalanced national economy. There were too many people on the land, multiplying products for which the foreign demand was diminishing, while we did not make enough for ourselves. Three million out of eight million free people in the United States were raising breadstuffs in seven states, but European markets totalling sixty million people had either been closed or were being closed to them. Russian wheat from Odessa had become an increasing factor in the competition for European markets. Even American cotton no longer enjoyed its virtual monopoly; the rise in prices before 1816 had produced a greater call for East Indian and Brazilian cotton. American cotton was a drug in the world market, and prices had fallen from thirty-three to sixteen and one-half cents a pound between January and June, 1819. The South was admonished to look at home for its outlet.[29]

Every opinion could apparently be countered by its opposite. If Carey and Niles deplored the redundancy of the rural population, in the West it was believed that too many had been drawn into the cities, while man was intended to live by tilling the land. In no other nation had "the thirst for the acquisition of riches without labour taken such deep root as among ourselves". But an exodus was preparing, and the West was ready to welcome it.[30] If, on the one hand, the belief that speculation was an evil product of the city was a tenet of the national creed, there was also the valid objection that a vicious speculation had grown up on the land as well, encouraged by the liberal credit feature of the national land policy. This was creating a debtor interest in the West, which might disrupt the Union.[31]

[28] *Select Speeches of John Serjeant of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1832), p. 164.

[29] Carey, *Essays*, pp. 323 ff. (The New Olive Branch); pp. 470 ff. (The Farmer's and Planter's Friend); and pp. 399, 492 (Address to Congress). *Cf.* the figures of the world cotton trade in *Niles' Register*, Jan. 30, 1819.

[30] The Cincinnati *Inquisitor Advertiser*, June 8, 1819.

[31] *Niles' Register*, Sept. 4, 1819. Between 1815 and 1819 the amount of the debt on land bought from the government increased from three to nearly eighteen million dollars. Benjamin Horace Hibbard, *A History of the Public Land Policies* (New York, 1924), p. 97.

The most dangerous factor in the situation was undoubtedly the lengthening chain of entangled debts which stretched from the merchants and manufacturers in England to the American seaboard and from there westward and southward. At the far end of it a "wild son of Tennessee who has been with Jackson, can ill brook that his bit of land, perhaps his rifle, should be torn from him by a neighbouring shopkeeper, that the proceeds may travel eastward, where the 'sceptre' of money has fixed itself. . . . This subject is a painful one, but. . . . We have no patience with those who tell us coldly that things will correct themselves . . . . We cannot believe that the remedy consists in folding our arms".[32] But the matter of a proper remedy was no less painful, presenting indeed a dilemma, which the congressional committee on manufactures clearly perceived and described in 1821. The people were looking to the government for relief, and the latter reversed the operation, "the resources of both exhausted; both marching to poverty . . . in the same road, on the same principles; their expenses exceeding their receipts".[33]

For the relief of distress due to depression there were ample advice, much agitation, and even some actual achievement. The advice was at times quite detached and reasonable; the action taken under the pressure of urgent need often took flight in palliative in the guise of panacea. The country survived both. There were those who offered neither advice nor remedy, but believed rather that the distress was not serious. This was particularly characteristic of the official attitude. Mathew Carey complained that when he first began to depict conditions in 1819 he was censured for it; the misery he described was denied; and, in any case, it was objected that such writing was pernicious in discouraging immigration. Carey, however, persisted, protesting:

> I respectfully ask those fastidious gentlemen, whether 'numerous families being deprived of the common necessaries of life'—the 'prisons overflowing with insolvent debtors'—and 'vast numbers of industrious farmers being driven from their homes, and forced to seek in the uncultivated forests of the west, that shelter of which they had been deprived in their native state', be not as complete proofs of misery as can be exhibited?

Carey also complained of congressional obduracy in refusing relief, while in a series of messages the President long continued to ignore or

[32] *The American* (New York), Aug. 28, 1819.

[33] Quoted on the title-page of Carey's *Address to the Farmers of the United States*, separately and in the *Essays*.

to minimize the existing depression.[34] In his message of December, 1819, Monroe made passing allusion to the contraction of credit and the industrial depression. A year later, he waxed eloquent over "the prosperous and happy condition of our country . . . it is impossible to behold so gratifying, so glorious a spectacle, without being penetrated with the most profound and grateful acknowledgments to the Supreme Author of All Good for such manifold and inestimable blessings". To be sure, there had been "pressures on certain interests . . . but they detract but little from the force of the remark already made", and the President was, therefore, unable to "regard these pressures . . . as otherwise than in the light of mild and instructive admonitions, warning us of dangers to be shunned in the future; teaching us lessons of economy . . .".[35] At that moment the government was not paying its way in a time of world peace and was, in fact, adding to the public debt.

Privately, of course, the administration was greatly concerned over the "alarming situation", which John Quincy Adams discussed both with the President and with the Secretary of the Treasury. It was admitted that distress was "universal in every part of the country. The revenue . . . must very sensibly and very soon be affected by this state of things, for which there seems to be no remedy but time and patience." Adams agreed with the President that

> They must work out their own termination. Government can do nothing, at least nothing by any measure yet proposed, but transfer discontents, and propitiate one class . . . by disgusting another. . . . As it is, the arbiters of weal and woe, the healers and destroyers, Time and Chance, must bring the catastrophe or the cure. . . . 'Thy will be done.'[36]

The official fatalism of the "Time and Patience" school was echoed in the New York *Gazette,* which denounced the "rant in most of our prints, about our distresses". From the present derangement important lessons were to be learned. "Trade will regulate itself. Banks will soon become more useful, and merchants more wise . . . . There is no real distress in the country, and we hope to hear no more of it."[37] In the face of such an attitude, Niles was justly critical of the general apathy

[34] Carey, *Essays,* p. 421 (Address to the Farmers); p. 309 (The New Olive Branch); and p. 196 (Addresses, new series).

[35] J. D. Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents* (Washington, 1899), II. 55, 72 ff. *Cf.* the sharp satire this message provoked in the Philadelphia *Weekly Aurora,* Nov. 20, 1820.

[36] Adams, *Memoirs,* IV. 375, 498; V. 129.

[37] Reprinted in the Cincinnati *Inquisitor,* Jan. 12, 1819; *cf.* the sharp rebuke appearing in the *National Advocate,* Dec. 10, 1818.

and indifference which prevailed. Every effort at supplying a remedy was condemned as a form of radicalism, and his conclusion was that "it has grown out of the powerful excitements caused by the late war, and the general depression of mind and business which followed it". We were helpless and rudderless.[38]

Niles himself was far from radical. He was opposed to the inflation of the currency; a thorough purgation, however unpalatable, was the only real cure possible. Aside from increased protection for industry, his main reliance was upon the hope that "honest men would get into fashion . . . [replacing] speculating madmen and visionary schemers". There also circulated such familiar slogans as "Take Courage" and "Keep Cool". The country was sound and would recognize the propriety of "going back to the simplicity of our forefathers and exchanging our disease for health . . . our dissipation for temperance and our vice for virtue . . . ".[39] The Order of Tammany proclaimed a new age and called for "a fundamental change in morals and habits".[40] But the hard times also produced a real suggestion of class disaffection and even a threat of class conflict. A writer calling himself One of the People addressed a "Morsel of Advisement to the Rich", in which he warned them that the common people greatly outnumbered them. These were times "to try your souls". They could continue to extort and to oppress, "but if you do so, a woful chance will it prove in the end". They would do better to show themselves "rich in good works . . . . Thus will ye take the surest way to preserve your treasures from being moth-eaten, and will lay a good foundation against the time to come."[41]

More concretely, however, the problem was to restore prosperity. Economicus, an anonymous writer in the press, began by defining the term and then offered some sound advice for its restoration. Prosperity was "nothing but a lively exchange of commodities". To bring it about, those who could afford it should be encouraged to live and spend more liberally. Tradesmen must be content with lower prices and smaller profits; laborers also should accept lower wages, adjusted to the new level of prices, which had declined by about a third. Self-help was good, but the government must "throw a rope to sustain us till the tide changes".[42]

[38] *Niles' Register*, Feb. 10, 1821.

[39] *Ibid.*, Jan. 9, June 5, 12, 1819; Sept. 16, 1820; also the Rochester *Telegraph*, July 6, 1819.

[40] *Address of the Order of Tammany*, p. 13.

[41] Rochester *Telegraph*, July 28, 1819.

[42] *Ibid.*, Oct. 31, 1820; *The American* (New York), Aug. 28, 1819.

The time was particularly opportune for the protectionists, for whom there was no ill wind but blew some good. They launched an extensive campaign of propaganda, by means of meeting, memorial, association, and print, to convert both the public and Congress to the doctrine that relief could only be found in a new system of taxation and industrial protection. Four main points emerged in their program; they included higher import duties and the cash payment of customs dues, a Federal tax on public auctions, and a return to the war policy of internal excise taxes to supply the deficiency in the revenue. Local associations were formed in the larger Eastern cities, and in 1820 a national convention of the Friends of Domestic Industry was held at New York. Veteran agitators like Mathew Carey, whose activity in this aspect reached back to the beginnings of American industry, were now reënforced by the zeal of younger contemporaries like Niles at Baltimore; for a year New York was the seat of a strictly protectionist journal, *The Patron of Industry*.[43] The sentiment even penetrated into Boston, where it was admitted that the commercial boom was at an end and that prosperity was "bottomed upon the success of agriculture and manufactures, which begin to excite interest in proportion to the decline of commerce".[44]

The protectionists added to the clamor for an early convocation of Congress in 1819 in order to deal with the emergency, and eventually they had their day there, which was, in fact, prolonged for several years.[45] Their first victory was the recognition of manufactures as a major interest in national politics. A separate committee on manufactures was set up in Congress, divorced from the committee on commerce. Under the chairmanship of Mr. Baldwin of Pennsylvania, it went zealously to work and submitted three bills to Congress early in 1820, which promised to "cover our country with smiles in less than six months". Baldwin referred to the mass of popular petitions on the subject and defended the legislation as a necessary outcome of depression.

> When a nation thus complains, we are not to inquire if women and children cry. Pennsylvania speaks in a still more decided tone. . . . Five years ago she was the richest in the union . . . But . . . she has yielded to the pressure of general distress, and, for the first time in her history, has been obliged to resort to a stop law, to save the property and persons of her citizens.

[43] Bishop, II. 256; *cf.* my article on the Rise and Early Development of Industrial Consciousness in the United States, *Journal of Economic and Business History*, IV. (August, 1932, Supplement), 800, 802.

[44] Cited from the Boston *Yankee*, in *Niles' Register*, Nov. 13, 1819.

[45] *The American* (New York), June 16, 1819; *Niles' Register*, May 22, 1819.

The Senate blocked the tariff bill in 1820, and a second effort was also frustrated in 1821. Not until 1824 did the protectionists win a real congressional victory.[46]

A second matter which pressed for immediate action was the national revenue. Before 1819 the government receipts, particularly those derived from foreign trade, had been large. In 1816 the customs had yielded thirty-six million dollars; by 1821 they were reduced to thirteen millions. As late as 1818 the total revenue had been more than twenty-six million dollars, which was reduced progressively to some twenty-one millions in 1819, fifteen millions in 1820, and it did not recover until 1822, when it again reached twenty million dollars. In 1820 the deficit was met by an authorized loan of three million dollars, and in the following year a second loan of five millions was needed.[47] In addition, an annual fund of some five million dollars which had been used prior to 1819 for the redemption of the debt was now no longer available, and Niles predicted a further deficiency of fifteen million dollars in 1825 and 1826 when forty-one millions of the debt fell due. He believed that the customs revenues were a "broken staff" and that new internal taxes were necessary, since economies could not be made to yield more than two million dollars.[48]

Retrenchment and economy became familiar terms; a plea for the reduction of expenses was made at a meeting at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, as early as October, 1819.[49] In 1820 a Southern congressman ironically proposed the total abolition of the navy in the interest of economy, since in any case we were about to become a nation of weavers and would need no defense. A special committee of Congress proposed a number of ways in which the costs of government could be reduced. Unnecessary offices were to be abolished; salaries lowered to the level of 1809, and the military establishment cut from 10,000 to 6000, while half the naval force was to be recalled from active service. A few of these were finally enacted in 1821, and a total saving of two million dollars effected. The Secretary of War was reported to have cut into his pension

[46] *Niles' Register,* Apr. 1, May 6, June 3, 1820; Jan. 20, 1821; *Abridgment of the Debates of Congress,* VI. 603; McMaster, IV. 515, 521; F. W. Taussig, *The Tariff History of the United States* (New York, 1923), pp. 68, 74.

[47] *Niles' Register,* Dec. 22, 1821; *Abridgment of the Debates of Congress,* VII. 409, 609; Turner, p. 140; Davis Rich Dewey, *Financial History of the United States* (New York, 1924), p. 167.

[48] *Niles' Register,* July 1, 1820; Dec. 22, 1821; Apr. 27, 1822.

[49] *Ibid.,* Nov. 13, 1819; Adams, *Memoirs,* V. 231.

roll, reducing its 16,000 names by half.[50] The various states also were under public pressure to economize; and, in the case notably of New York and Connecticut, they even anticipated Congress in their program of retrenchment. In 1820 the New York State salary bill effected a saving of $22,000 a year. In New York City the mayor's salary, among others, was reduced from $5000 to $3000 a year. In Connecticut the annual budget was brought down from $100,000 in 1818 to $63,000 in 1820 and to $53,000 (in round figures) by 1822.[51]

One other large measure of relief assumed national proportions. This was in the interest of Federal land purchasers. In 1820 the Secretary of the Treasury reported to Congress that since 1789 the government had sold land to a value of forty-four million dollars, of which about half was still unpaid. One form of immediate relief was to allow debtors to pay with any bank notes which were "in good credit in the district". Another was to permit the purchasers in default to consolidate their holdings by keeping as much land as was covered by the payments already made at the new price of $1.25 an acre and surrendering the remainder without the penalty of complete forfeiture. This policy was continued through 1824.[52] The depression also afforded an opportunity to establish a new landmark in the evolution of the Federal land policy. The act of 1820 lowered the price from two dollars an acre to a dollar and a quarter, but it also abolished the credit provision in the act of 1800, requiring full payment in cash, and setting the minimum quantity of land which could be purchased at eighty acres.[53]

The more radical issues of debtor relief made little progress in national politics; in this respect certain state legislatures proved more responsive and in the end were held in check mainly by the Federal judiciary. Demands enough were made for some kind of national action as regards the currency, either to release it from its specie basis or to declare an embargo on specie exports, both of which proposals created alarm and provoked opposition, from Niles, for example, "as a mere

[50] *Niles' Register,* May 6, 1820; Feb. 10, 1821; *Abridgment of the Debates of Congress,* VII. 54; *cf.* also T. H. Benton, *Thirty Years' View, or a History of the Working of the American Government for Thirty Years* (New York, 1854), p. 11; James Schouler, *History of the United States* (New York, 1885), III. 174 f., 190.

[51] Rochester *Telegraph,* Aug. 31, 1819; Feb. 15, Apr. 4, 1820; *Niles' Register,* Apr. 14, July 7, 1821.

[52] *Niles' Register,* May 8, 1819; Dec. 9, 1820; Turner, p. 141; Benton, p. 11; *Abridgment of the Debates of Congress,* VI. 457; VII. 627; Hibbard, p. 94.

[53] *Abridgment of the Debates of Congress,* VI. 455 ff.; Turner, pp. 141–142; Hibbard, pp. 97 ff.

nostrum . . . to cure incurable disorders".[54] In Kentucky and Tennessee public meetings adopted resolutions which demanded the abolition of all banks and the establishment of a paper currency.[55] Congress, in the main, ignored the clamor; it did, however, take up a bill for the Federal regulation of bankruptcy in 1820 and again in the two succeeding years. It failed each time, in spite of the able advocacy of John Serjeant, supported by Niles, who looked to it for the protection of the creditor against the roguery encouraged by the various state insolvency acts. An earnest effort to abolish Federal imprisonment for debt also failed at this time.[56]

Since the relation of debtor to creditor fell for the most part within state jurisdiction, it was to the state legislature that the clamor for relief addressed itself, and here it received its most sympathetic hearing. In Benton's summary,

> Stop laws—property laws—replevin laws—stay laws—loan office laws—the intervention of the legislature between the creditor and the debtor: this was the business of legislation in three-fourths of the States of the Union—of all south and west of New England . . . . Distress the universal cry of the people: Relief, the universal demand thundered at the doors of all legislatures, State and federal.[57]

There was a humanitarian as well as an economic motive in this legislation, for the distress of the debtor in this period of depression strengthened the movement for the abolition of imprisonment for debt, and some progress was actually made in that direction. Already in 1817 New York State had abolished imprisonment for debtors owing less than $25. By 1823 a number of other states had mitigated the hardships of the law in various degrees. Vermont and New Hampshire exempted persons owing petty debts, as did Pennsylvania, which also freed women from imprisonment. Kentucky, Ohio, and North Carolina abolished it for debtors who turned over their property, while the newer states, such as Indiana, Mississippi, Illinois, and Alabama embodied a similar provision in their constitutions.[58]

The relief mainly needed in the emergency, however, was economic,

[54] *Niles' Register,* Dec. 5, 1818; *The American* (New York), July 3, Aug. 18, 1819. The Albany *Gazette* (June 14, 1819) warned that such proposals would only produce "a windy debate, some futile expedients . . . and a heavy run upon the treasury".

[55] *Niles' Register,* Jan. 30, May 13, July 24, 1819.

[56] *Niles' Register,* Apr. 8, 1820; Feb. 10, Mar. 3, 24, 1821; Feb. 2, Mar. 6, 1822; Feb. 8, 1823. *Cf. Abridgment of the Debates of Congress,* VII. 233, 280; F. R. Noel, *A History of the Bankruptcy Clause of the Constitution* (Gettysburg, 1918), pp. 134 ff.

[57] Benton, pp. 5 ff.

[58] *Niles' Register,* Feb. 26, 1820; Feb. 9, 1822; Jan. 18, 1823; McMaster, IV. 533 ff.

in order to save the debtors' assets, such as they were, from the demoralizing prices established at forced sales under the wholesale application of the insolvency laws. In New York State the complaint was made that the law was too hard on the poor debtor; in 1820 the mechanics of Ontario County petitioned the legislature to protect their tools and implements against executions, especially for the default of rent. In the New York senate a bill was offered to require an appraisal of the debtor's property by three disinterested persons before sale. A committee of the assembly even recommended that the comptroller sell the bank stock owned by the state and lend the proceeds on real estate.[59] What was only proposed in New York, and more, was actually adopted in other states, particularly in the West. Tennessee enacted a stay law in 1819, which required the creditor to accept the notes of the state bank, and others at par with them, or else wait two years for his judgment in court. A similar law was adopted in Illinois in 1821. Both states followed through the logic of their stay legislation by establishing state banks and authorizing them to lend their notes on real estate. These notes were also expected to supply the shortage of ready money.[60]

Kentucky adopted a full program of debtor relief and could serve as a model to other states in this respect. After the Bank of Kentucky suspended payments at the close of 1819, the legislature promptly enacted a stay law, and in 1820 set up a new Bank of the Commonwealth, which was to issue notes up to three million dollars. Without capital or stockholders or specie, its sole assets were a state grant of $7000 for the printing of notes. If a creditor refused to accept the notes, he might be made to wait two years for an execution. After 1823, when the state court of appeals nullified the legislation, a political battle of serious proportions developed between the debtor and creditor parties for the control of the judiciary. For several years two rival courts of appeal competed for jurisdiction; in the end the old court party won.[61]

Other states followed the example of Kentucky. Indiana had a stay law in 1822. Missouri began its career as a state by establishing a loan office for the relief of debtors. With Ohio and Tennessee it also adopted the principle of appraisement, by which property offered for sale under

[59] *Niles' Register*, Jan. 22, 1820; *The National Advocate*, Mar. 25, 1818; also the Rochester *Telegraph*, Apr. 13, 1819; Mar. 21, 1820.

[60] *Niles' Register*, Sept. 2, Dec. 27, 1820; Mar. 31, Sept. 15, 1821; Sumner, pp. 146, 157.

[61] *Niles' Register*, Nov. 25, 1820; Feb. 17, 1821; Sumner, pp. 120, 131, 137; Turner, p. 139; McMaster, IV. 508. Also Samuel Perkins, *Historical Sketches of the United States* (New York, 1830), p. 270.

an execution must bring a minimum price as established by impartial appraisers. Even in Pennsylvania the governor recommended such legislation, including a provision for a loan office to lend up to two million dollars. It was, however, rejected by a committee of the legislature.[62]

All this legislation gave rise to a great clamor and clash of opinion when the judiciary attacked it and invalidated it in several states, among them Kentucky, Tennessee, Maryland and Missouri. The controversy assumed large national proportions when it was focussed upon the issue of the Bank of the United States and its liability to the taxes which Maryland, Ohio, and Kentucky attempted to impose and to collect. Early in March, 1819, coinciding closely with the exposure of the Bank scandal by the congressional committee of investigation, the Supreme Court, in McCulloch *v.* Maryland, denied the states the right to tax the Bank. Following this came the collision of state and Federal jurisdiction in Ohio, involving the same issue. A terrific logomachy ensued, which eventually crystallized into a proposal to amend the Constitution. In January, 1822, Senator Johnson of Kentucky submitted and defended a resolution providing that appellate jurisdiction in all cases affecting a state or a state law should thereafter belong to the Senate. The initial proposal he attributed to Pennsylvania, as a sequel to the Olmstead cases. Pennsylvania had yielded at that time, however, in the interest of public order, and had refused to use force. But now the McCulloch case was a further instance of judicial tryanny, which needed curbing. Virginia, to be sure, went so far as to claim the right to decide such issues for herself, but this, Johnson argued, would produce anarchy, and a higher tribunal was, therefore, more appropriate.[63]

Thus was the logic of the depression of 1819 carried to a climax. What had begun as a contraction of money and credit, accompanied by a general decline of prices and property values, led finally, by an unbroken chain of economic circumstance and political agitation, to a questioning of the Constitution itself, particularly in reference to the newly developed power of judicial interpretation. It was appropriate

[62] Philadelphia *Weekly Aurora,* Mar. 27, 1820; *Niles' Register,* Aug. 11, 1821; Sumner, pp. 150, 156, 161; McMaster, IV. 494, 510.

[63] *Niles' Register,* Mar. 20, 1819; Aug. 4, 1821; Sept. 15, 1821; Feb. 23, June 8, 1822. *Cf.* also Schouler, III. 119; Sumner, p. 129; Wildman, p. 108; McMaster, IV. 496, 499; V. 406, 412. Senator Johnson continued to propose amendments to the same end in the next few years, supported by other men from Kentucky. *Abridgment of the Debates of Congress,* VII. 145, 152; Charles Warren, *Congress, the Constitution, and the Supreme Court* (Boston, 1925), p. 218.

that, while Massachusetts condemned such procedure, Ohio and Kentucky approved it, appealing to the authority of Virginia, which at this time missed passing similar resolutions by a small margin.[64] Neither this, nor the more immediate economic issue of money and credit, was settled then, of course; both remained available for agitation in succeeding periods of depression, thus giving a kind of continuity to what has otherwise been an occasional but recurring phenomenon of American social and economic history. In the wake of this early depression came an intensification of class consciousness, as between the rich and the poor, the creditors and the debtors, those who lived by honest labor and those who engaged in vicious speculation. A permanent by-product of the period illustrating this contrast was the savings bank. At a time when banks were being discredited as the seats of vicious and grasping speculation, a place of safe-keeping was created, without stocks or notes, for the money of the mechanic and the small tradesman. It was to encourage thrift in such people. Started as early as December, 1816, at Philadelphia, the Savings Fund Society was quickly followed by the Provident Institution for Savings at Boston, and in July, 1819, by the Savings Bank at New York. The New York institution was sponsored by the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism; it accepted deposits of as little as one dollar, and it paid interest at five per cent. on amounts of five dollars or more. It was at once hailed as a "moral institution", seeking no profit, and boasting William Bayard as its president, with Colden, Pintard, and Livingston among its trustees. At the end of its first year, in 1820, the New York bank had an aggregate of $313,000 in deposits, and its accounts numbered 2995.[65]

SAMUEL REZNECK.

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

[64] *Niles' Register*, Feb. 23, 1823; McMaster, IV. 502.

[65] Albany *Gazette*, June 24, 1819; *The American*, July 3, 1819; June 29, 1820; *The National Advocate*, July 9, 1819; *Second Annual Report* of the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism, pp. 14–15. *Cf.* also Bishop, II. 230; O. C. Lightner, *The History of Business Depressions* (New York, 1922), p. 112.

BELGIAN NEUTRALITY: ITS ORIGIN AND INTERPRETATION

THE neutrality of Belgium was the logical result of powerful historic forces. Belgium lies at the crossroads of two of Europe's most important international highways, the route between England and the Rhine Valley on the one hand and that connecting Paris with northern Europe on the other. It is the center of the most populous, most intensely industrialized, and probably the richest area of the Western World. In addition, the region has been for centuries a sort of cultural "no man's land" between the two great races, the Latin and the Teuton, which have found here no natural barriers to define their territorial limits. As a consequence the region has been the scene of continued struggle. The unstable equilibrium of ethnic forces, coupled with conflicting economic factors, led in the political realm to constant efforts to conquer it or to set up a so-called buffer state. Again and again powerful neighbors have sought to annex it; at least five foreign powers have possessed it within modern times, while a sixth, envious of its principal seaport, helped to set up trade barriers to stifle its development. For more than two centuries the port of Antwerp, strategically the best located in Europe, stagnated because of restrictions placed upon its commerce by jealous rivals. "C'est à cause d'Anvers que je suis ici", said Napoleon at St. Helena, a logical conclusion to his earlier declaration, "Antwerp in my hands is a pistol aimed at the heart of England".

Caesar fought for Belgium, Charlemagne controlled it from his nearby capital at Aachen, Edward III. intervened in its affairs to support the Flemish weavers against the count of Flanders and the king of France, Louis XI. seized Artois and adjacent towns, and Louis XIV. tried to annex the border territory, but had to be satisfied with a small part because the English and Dutch invoked the balance of power and formed the Grand Alliance to protect the provinces. At the end of the War of the Spanish Succession, the Barrier Treaty provided for a line of fortresses in the Austrian Netherlands garrisoned in part by the Dutch against France. In its essence, this was a sort of neutralization, and the barrier fortress question was for a considerable time intimately associated with that of neutrality.

During the Revolutionary and Napoleonic era France conquered and annexed the entire country. Following the collapse of the Napoleonic

Empire, the victorious powers impelled by anxiety for the peace of Europe and fearful of the danger of future aggression by France, not only set up a strong buffer state by uniting Belgium with Holland, but in a secret military protocol attached to the Quadruple Alliance,[1] contracted that if the *casus fœderis* should be invoked, Dutch, English, and Prussian troops were to occupy certain Belgian fortresses. Thus the buffer state was to be adequately buttressed against revolutionary outbreaks and the annexationist tendencies of its powerful neighbor.[2]

For reasons well known to history, the union of the two states was destroyed by the revolt of the Belgians in the summer of 1830. On August 25 they drove the Dutch from Brussels, proclaimed their independence, and proceeded to establish their own government. Consternation and alarm prevailed among the powers. The action of the Belgians not only disturbed the *status quo,* but threatened to destroy the whole bulwark for security and peace the powers had built up with so much care. Moreover, the July Revolution in Paris had made the situation doubly dangerous. Belgium in revolt might well invite the revolutionary elements in France to attempt to rectify the northeastern frontier, rid France of the humiliation of the border fortresses, and possibly annex the country. Under the circumstances, the appeal of William I., king of the United Netherlands, to the powers met with an immediate response.

The London Conference was called. It held its first session on November 4, 1830, in the British foreign office, with the Duke of Wellington presiding. Among the delegates, Prince Talleyrand was easily first in experience and reputation. He had served many masters, practically every government of France from 1789 to 1830. But he was getting old—over 76—and he had had a strenuous life. Nevertheless, his colleagues felt that he needed watching, not only because of his reputation for ability and trickiness, but because they were suspicious of the newly established July Monarchy which he represented. So much impressed was Metternich with Talleyrand's cleverness that he appointed a second delegate, Esterhazy, to assist Wessenberg, the Austrian minister in London, to offset the great diplomatic skill of the prince. The

[1] The important instruments of the alliance were the Treaty of Chaumont of March 1, 1814, the second Treaty of Paris of November 20, 1815, and the protocol of November 15, 1818, signed at Aix-la-Chapelle.

[2] The extent to which the same motives prevailed at the London Conference in 1830–1832 is shown clearly by the fact that these agreements of 1814–1818 between the Four Powers were not abrogated, but were incorporated in the secret barrier fortress treaty of December 14, 1831, after the independence and neutrality of Belgium were set up.

czar was represented by his ambassador, Prince Lieven, and Matuszevicz, who served as the secretary of the conference. They were ably assisted by the Princess Lieven, whose remarkable letters to the czar indicate that she knew more of what really went on than did his official representative. Heinrich von Bülow represented Prussia. A man of 38, he was extremely industrious. Wellington, who respected his industry, once dubbed him a "wise fool" who was always discovering something remarkable in every trifling incident. His reports of the conference proceedings, not yet published, are excellent. Aberdeen attended the first two sessions for England, and then gave way to Palmerston, the new foreign minister, a vigorous man of 46, "very well dressed, very good looking, with large black whiskers". He had been secretary of war from 1809 to 1828 in five successive ministries, and was thoroughly schooled in the policies of Castlereagh. Soon to become the most English of the long line of English foreign ministers, he was, like the other delegates of the Four Powers, extremely distrustful of France.

The conference met at intervals over a period of nearly two years from November 4, 1830, to October 1, 1832. The results of its arduous labors are embodied in the protocols of seventy sessions, innumerable notes, dispatches, and memoranda, and in three important treaties.[3] The problems confronting the delegates were extremely complicated and difficult, according to Talleyrand "the most perplexing" of any with which he had been associated. At its first session, the conference decreed an armistice between the two parties: "Hostilities shall entirely cease on both sides", it announced. On December 20, 1830, it recognized the separation of Belgium as a *fait accompli,* declaring:

> The events of the last four months have unhappily demonstrated that . . . the union of Belgium with Holland is destroyed; and that it now becomes

[3] The official report of the proceedings of the London Conference was published by the governments of England, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands, *e.g., Papers relating to the Affairs of Belgium,* presented to both Houses of Parliament, 3 pts. (London, 1833); (also *Journals of the House of Commons,* 1833, appendix D, State Papers); *Collection des protocols des conférences tenues à Londres* (Paris, 1833); *Rapports du ministre des Affaires étrangères . . . et autres documents publiés par l'ordre du Congrès national* (3 vols., Brussels, 1831 ff.); *Recueil de pièces diplomatiques relatives aux affaires de la Hollande et de la Belgique, en 1830 et 1831* (3 vols., The Hague, 1831–1833). An extensive literature consisting of over five hundred titles exists on the various phases of Belgian neutrality and independence. Aside from the memoirs and correspondence they fall in general into several groups: First, those that are essentially of a historical nature like the works by De Ridder, Guyot, Hampe, and Strupp; second, those devoted more particularly to the question of international law involved in neutrality agreements; and, third, the many studies dealing with the military aspects of the Belgian situation including, of course, the problem of the border fortresses,

indispensable to have recourse to other arrangements to accomplish the intentions which the union in question was designed to carry into execution. . . .

The Conference will consequently proceed to discuss and concert such new arrangements as may be most proper for combining the future independence of Belgium with the stipulations of Treaties, with the interests and security of other Powers and with the preservation of the balance of Europe.[4]

Exactly one month later, at the memorable session of January 20, the conference, after a protracted and bitter struggle which lasted eight and a half hours, voted the independence and neutralization of the new state. Articles V. and VI. of the protocol read:

Belgium, within those limits that shall be determined and traced, conformably to the arrangements laid down in Articles 1, 2 and 4, of the present Protocol, shall form a perpetually neutral State. The Five Powers guarantee to it that perpetual neutrality, as well as the integrity and inviolability of its territory, within the above-mentioned limits.

By a just reciprocity, Belgium shall be bound to observe the same neutrality towards all other States, and not to make any attempt against their internal or external tranquillity.[5]

In the subsequent discussions and adjustments, these articles were shifted about and considerably modified. The preliminaries of peace drawn up in the session of June 26, in eighteen articles, embody the arrangements for neutrality and guarantee in articles IX. and X. They are the same in substance as articles V. and VI. of the protocol of January 20, save for a self-denying clause by the powers excluding intervention on their part in the domestic affairs of Belgium, and another assuring to the Belgians the right of self-defense.

In the Articles of Separation drafted by the plenipotentiaries on October 14, 1831, between Belgium and Holland, the two articles were reduced and consolidated into one (Art. VII.) as follows:

Belgium, within the limits specified in Articles I., II. and IV., shall form an independent and perpetually neutral State. It shall be bound to observe such neutrality toward all other States.[6]

Naturally the important provisions of the earlier drafts as to neutrality are not included in the treaty to be signed by the Dutch. On the

[4] Protocol no. 7, *Commons' Journals,* LXXXVIII. 1051.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 1055. Although Talleyrand signed the protocol his objections were confirmed by his government and official consent was not given till the conference session of April 17. For an analysis of the conditions underlying the conference action, see Palmerston to Granville, January 7, 21, and 27, 1830, Sir Henry Lytton Bulwer, *The Life of Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston* (London, 1870), II. 27–35.

[6] *Commons' Journals,* LXXXVIII. 1068, 1094.

other hand, in inviting the signatures of the plenipotentiaries of the Netherlands and of Belgium to the treaty, the representatives of the Five Powers declared that the articles were to have "the full force and validity of a solemn Convention between His Majesty the King of the Netherlands, (Belgium) and the Five Powers", that the "Five Powers guarantee their execution", and that "this Treaty, signed under the auspices of the Conference of London, shall be placed under the formal guarantee of the Five Powers".[7] This general guarantee received further formal expression in Article XXV. of the draft treaty of November 15, 1831, which remained the status between Belgium and the powers until 1839 when the Dutch finally yielded and agreed to sign.

On April 19, 1839, the signatures were affixed to the agreements and the arduous labors of the conference came to an end. Three formal treaties embody the results of its work, one between the Five Powers and the Netherlands, another between Belgium and the Netherlands, and a third between the Five Powers and Belgium. The neutrality provision, that is, Article VII., is found in all three. In the treaty between the powers and Belgium, signed on November 15, 1831, there is a guarantee of execution as follows:

> The Courts of Great Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, and Russia guarantee to His Majesty the King of the Belgians the execution of all the preceeding Articles.[8]

A year later in the convention between Great Britain and France relative to the Netherlands, signed on October 22, 1832, the preamble again brings in the guarantee by referring to the agreement of November 15, 1831:

> The execution whereof by the terms of Article XXV. of the said Treaty, has been jointly guaranteed by their said Majesties, and by their Majesties the Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia, and the Emperor of Russia.[9]

Notwithstanding this, the plenipotentiaries were manifestly not satisfied with the guarantee, for as pointed out above, on December 14, 1831, they entered into a secret agreement to maintain the system of fortresses. From the outset the plenipotentiaries themselves seem to have been uncertain about the dependability of the guarantee or the obligations of the powers under it.

The origin of the idea of Belgian neutrality has been generally attributed to Prince Talleyrand. How far his own assumption of credit for its authorship is responsible, it is difficult to tell.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 1096.
[8] Edward Hertslet, *The Map of Europe by Treaty*, vol. II., no. 153.
[9] *Ibid.*, no. 162.

In his memoirs, Talleyrand, after speaking of the various proposals for the solution of the Belgian question says:

> But all these measures were only provisional palliatives which did not free us from permanent dangers. For several days I had thought over a counter-stroke which I considered would be decisive, inasmuch as it would put an end to the hopes of the revolutionary party in Belgium and France, as well as to the reactionary attempts of the King of Holland: this was, a declaration by the Powers of the neutrality of Belgium. I submitted it to the Conference at the sitting of the 20th of January, and had the satisfaction of obtaining its adoption, and insertion in the protocol of that day.[10]

This corresponds in the main with his letter to Sébastiani of January 21, in which he reports the action of the conference of the previous day:

> I have the honor to transmit herewith the protocol of our conference of yesterday. By it you will see that following up the idea I expressed to you in my dispatch of the 10th of this month, (No. 7) we have reached the point of securing the recognition in principle by the plenipotentiaries of Belgian neutrality. I was strongly supported in this by Lord Palmerston whom I always find very straightforward and of a really pacific disposition. I need hardly tell you that the struggle has been long and difficult. The importance of this decision was fully felt by all members of the conference and in consequence our sitting lasted eight hours and a half.[11]

Curiously, however, neither in the published correspondence nor in the archives is there any dispatch of January 10 corresponding to this description. Probably the dispatch of January 16 is meant, for it is number 70, and in it, if internal evidence means anything, the neutrality idea, so far as Talleyrand is concerned, is developed for the first time. After telling how he returned from a visit to the king at Brighton to attend the conference much sooner than was necessary, Prince Lieven being ill, and Palmerston and Matuszevicz in the country, he says:

> Under the necessity of trying out every possibility, I have come upon an idea which will perhaps satisfy no one but may for that reason succeed better than others . . . it is the formation of a federal government in Belgium analogous to that of Switzerland, that is to say, with neutrality recognized (neutralité reconnue) . . . .[12]

[10] *Memoirs of the Prince de Talleyrand,* Duc de Broglie, ed., trans. by R. L. de Beaufort and Mrs. Angus Hall, IV. 14. I have used the English translation save when there was especial reason for referring to the French and for changes of rendering. The editorial work is faulty and at times misleading.

[11] *Correspondance diplomatique de Talleyrand: Ambassade de Talleyrand à Londres, 1830–1834,* 1re partie, G. Pallain, ed. (Paris, 1891), pp. 181–182. In the original the number is correctly given as 70, not 7 as by Pallain.

[12] Archives du ministère des Affaires étrangères: Correspondance politique, Angleterre, vol. 632, ff. 46–49. In the published *Correspondance* (p. 174), Pallain, the editor, quotes Sébastiani's reply to the suggestion that the king wished to reflect on a matter of such importance and that he would send his reply in a few days. He gives January 17

Four days later, he wrote:

> I continue to congratulate myself on the declaration of neutrality, which up to the present has been received with great approbation by the statesmen of those countries who have learned of it. All, regardless of party affiliations, look upon it as an act of political sagacity honorable to modern civilization and made to assure the maintenance of peace by the means it affords for the adjustment, if not of all claims, at least of every essential interest. I should add that in acceding to it, they are without exception of the opinion that it is entirely to the advantage of France.[13]

Talleyrand's contemporaries, like many later historians, have taken this and other statements by him as to his authorship too largely at face value. Broglie says: "The leading rôle of Talleyrand in bringing about this salutary solution is incontestable. . . . To the merit of having conceived the idea, he added that of following it through to its consummation." Émile Bourgeois writes: "The Belgian affair was to end pacifically in accordance with the pleasure of Talleyrand." "By his energy and clarity of vision, Talleyrand at London, as formerly at Vienna, governed Europe and placed France in the first rank."[14] "To have led the powers to accept this solution, better still to have induced them to bring it about themselves, that is the great diplomatic juggler's trick—*tour de passe-passe diplomatique*—of Talleyrand at the Conference of London", says Raymond Guyot in his study entitled, La dernière négotiation de Talleyrand: L'indépendance de la Belgique.[15]

Evidence in the unpublished letters and reports of the other plenipotentiaries preserved in the archives of the foreign offices in London, Vienna, and Berlin indicate not only a very different origin of the neutrality idea, but also a radical difference between Talleyrand's plan for the new state and that advocated by the others, and finally adopted by the conference. Bülow, Esterhazy, Wessenberg, and Palmerston all ascribe its origin as well as the motives which prompted it to the necessity of finding a formula for Belgian independence which would at the same time secure peace, maintain the balance of power, and put a check on the ambitions of France. In their report to Metternich of January 23, Esterhazy and Wessenberg tell how the representatives of the Four Powers,

as the date of the foreign minister's reply. This, if correct, would have confirmed the claim of an earlier dispatch on the neutrality question than that of January 16 since the latter could not have reached Paris in time for a reply by January 17. The problem is, however, entirely solved by the fact that the original in the foreign office archives is dated January 19, that is, two days later, and therefore at just the right time for the reply to Talleyrand's of the 16th. *Cf.* Arch. Aff. Étr., Corr. Pol., Angleterre, vol. 632, ff. 58–60.

[13] *Memoirs of Talleyrand*, IV. 23.

[14] Émile Bourgeois, *Manuel historique de politique étrangère*, III. 80, 81–82.

[15] *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, III. 281 (italics mine).

much worried over the dangers of a European conflict arising from the Franco-Belgian situation, and determined to force France "to renounce formally every project of aggrandizement", came to an agreement among themselves beforehand and without the knowledge of Talleyrand. They say further:

> The news from France and Belgium which reached here eight days ago . . . seemed to demand a prompt decision on the part of the Allied Courts. . . . To this end the plenipotentiaries of the Four Powers agreed first to confer without delay upon the basis of the boundaries between Holland and Belgium, and second, to place all the lands which will make up the future state of Belgium under the ægis of a perpetual neutrality. . . . It was evident to us that the line of fortresses designed to serve as a barrier against France had ceased to be of any advantage whatsoever to Europe, and that instead of henceforth affording a guarantee of security, it would only give rise to continual dangers. It practically ceases to serve any purpose as soon as it cannot be defended. Now, if the united forces of Holland and Belgium were, as it is proved, insufficient to furnish the necessary garrisons, how can those which Belgium alone can muster, be adequate?
>
> Today in order to secure the double purpose of pacifying a restless people and of checking the spirit of conquest of a neighboring power, it seemed to us that the means could only be found in a moral force—*une force morale*—such as is found in the neutrality guaranteed by the Great Powers.[16]

In other words, Belgian neutrality—"a moral force"—is to "pacify the restless Belgians and check the spirit of conquest of a neighboring power". Then follows the surprising statement:

> Lord Palmerston, whose activity and *savoir faire* on this occasion cannot be sufficiently praised, undertook to prepare Prince Talleyrand for the decisions arrived at between the plenipotentiaries of the Allied Courts before making of them a subject of the conference.[17]

Still more definite on the inception of the idea is the report by Bülow, the Prussian plenipotentiary, written on January 15, that is, five days before the session of January 20, and a day before Talleyrand's letter of January 16 in which manifestly he first reports the plan. Speaking of the neutrality project and Palmerston's attitude toward it, he says:

[16] Esterhazy and Wessenberg to Metternich, Jan. 23, 1831, Vienna, Haus-Hof- und Staats Archiv, Staatskanzlei, England, fasc. 253. In a report of the same day by Esterhazy alone, he says: "L'idée d'acte de neutralité est émanée de Lord Palmerston mais Lord Grey et même Lord Holland y ont eu leur part. Le Prince de Talleyrand de son coté l'avait déjà agitée antérieurement mais en l'accouplant toujours à celle d'un état fédéral qu'il vise à établir en Belgique . . . ." *Ibid.*, no. 2, Lit. B. Even Esterhazy was not informed on the last point.

[17] Palmerston's astuteness in securing the coöperation of others by leading them to think that ideas he had put in their minds had originated with themselves is well illustrated by a remark in the *Memoirs of the Duchesse de Dino* (I. 131) about M. de Miraflorès proclaiming himself the author of the Quadruple Alliance, "the first idea of which was suggested to him by Lord Palmerston".

Always occupied with this question, the Secretary of State consulted me a few days ago upon the advantages of a perpetual neutrality of Belgium after the fashion of that agreed upon at Vienna in favor of the Swiss in the declaration of March 20, 1815.[18]

Here we have not only the idea of neutrality but the phrase "perpetual neutrality", and reference to the Swiss prototype as well. In point of time, Bülow's report was written on the day before Talleyrand reported his plan for a neutral and federated Belgium to Sébastiani. Furthermore Bülow, writing on the 15th, says Palmerston consulted him on the advantages of neutrality a few days before. This places the discussion of neutrality by Palmerston and Bülow at least several days before Talleyrand mentions the matter. Furthermore, there is not a hint of the neutrality idea in Talleyrand's previous dispatches. Had he entertained the idea and reported on it on January 10, as he claims, and as even Hampe, the most penetrating critic of Talleyrand's authorship, accepts, there should be no difficulty in establishing the fact. But the evidence is not to be found. Not only is there no dispatch of January 10 of the tenor claimed by him, but in the dispatches of January 9 and 13, in which he goes into a discussion of the whole question of Belgium, the neutrality idea is not even suggested. This, added to his error in giving January 10 as the date of the report in which he first speaks of the plan, arouses the suspicion that having once taken up the idea, Talleyrand seized upon it as his own. Writing from memory, and harrassed by the difficulties of his rôle, he was so deeply concerned with the task of maintaining the coöperation with England, and at the same time appeasing the extremists in France, that he overstressed his own contribution to the solution in order to make it more palatable in Paris.

But Bülow's letter of January 15 refers to evidence for a much earlier consideration of the neutrality idea than that of the discussions in January. He says in the dispatch just cited,

The plan to assure the independence of Belgium by a guarantee of the Five Powers was made the subject of my very humble report which I had the honor to address to Your Majesty under date of November 12, last year. This project received the complete approval of Lord Palmerston from the first day of his entry into the ministry. He has never lost sight of this object, and has made it entirely his own (Se l'est entièrement approprié).

The report of November 12, 1830,[19] here referred to, confirms in the

[18] Bülow to the king, Jan. 15, 1831, Berlin, Geheimes Staatsarchiv, Auswärtiges Amt, Repositeur I., England, no. 86.

[19] Bülow to the king, Nov. 12, 1830, Geh. Staatsarch. Ausw. Amt, Rep. I., England, no. 83. Hampe says he failed to find this report. *Cf.* K. Hampe, *Das belgische Bollwerk*, p. 42, n. 1.

main Bülow's statement made three months later concerning it. He there suggests a plan in regard to Belgium which he believed might succeed if it were advocated by His Majesty and the king of the Netherlands. According to his proposal, "it would be necessary to emphasize that the powers were agreed that none of them should possess Belgium without the consent of the others, and that contravention of this engagement would place *ipso facto* such power in a state of war against the other four".

The advantages of such an act, he continues, should recommend its adoption. Belgium would be really independent and not French, her frontier fortresses would be placed under an efficacious guarantee, and the secret policy to gain territory by the aid of revolts aroused in the adjoining countries would be lost to France as soon as it became clear that the attempts would not succeed.

In a letter to Esterhazy dated November 15, 1830, Metternich after summarizing the instructions from Berlin to Bülow, which had just reached Vienna, instructed the Austrian delegate to adhere to the line of policy therein set forth. Commenting on Belgian independence, he said:

> The separation of Belgium from Holland, since it has been recognized by the government of the Netherlands and enacted, cannot longer be contested by the powers. Nevertheless it can be agreed to only under such forms and conditions that security against France can thereby be successfully maintained. . . .
>
> Belgium can exist for Europe only by a guarantee of its future political status (nur mit einer Garantie seiner künftigen politischen Richtung bestehen).[20]

Equally suggestive of the idea of neutralization is the statement about this time by Matuszevicz. In a letter to Nesselrode as early as November 15, 1830,[21] Matuszevicz describes a plan which, although it does not use

[20] Metternich to Esterhazy, Nov. 15, 1830, Haus-Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Weisungen, London, XI. The strong dislike of the developments in Belgium is seen in the following: "The Belgian affair is regarded by our august master with the greatest abhorrence. However the truth may be disguised, it starts with countenancing a rebellion. But since the affair exists as a mournful reality, it must be taken in hand and brought to the least unfavorable conclusion possible."

[21] Matuszevicz to Nesselrode, Nov. 15, 1830, Martens, *Recueil des traités et conventions conclus par la Russe avec les puissances étrangères*, XI. 442. Lannoy's statement that Matuszevicz "was probably the first of the diplomats assembled in London to have the idea of imposing perpetual neutrality upon Belgium" goes too far. Lannoy did not have the statements by Bülow, Esterhazy, or Palmerston. *Cf.* Fl. de Lannoy, *Les origines diplom ues de l'indépendance belge: La Conférence de Londres, 1830–1831*, p. 129.

the term neutrality, nevertheless sets forth its principal features. He said:

> The means of saving Belgium from France, and Holland from Belgium would be this: The Five Powers would guarantee in common by a protocol or treaty the existence of the kingdom of Belgium, declare that none of them would be able under any circumstances to invade or occupy it without the consent of the other four, and further, that they equally guarantee Holland against all invasion on the part of Belgium.

Here we have, as Lannoy correctly says, every essential feature of the neutrality idea. It is by the secretary of the conference, who was a very close friend of Palmerston. Taken in connection with Bülow's reports it is strong confirmation of the fact that the neutrality question was under discussion at the time Palmerston assumed the direction of the foreign office on November 22, 1830, an indication, moreover, that neutralization was, so to speak, a logical solution of the problem. This was clearly Palmerston's view as appears in the draft of a cipher dispatch to Turin, St. Petersburg, and Vienna of December 31, 1830. "Belgium must have", he said, "a sovereign agreeable to all parties in the nation . . . a constitution of her own choice", and she "ought to have an assurance against attack by a self-denying engagement on the part of each of the Five Powers".[22]

Furthermore, Palmerston and not Talleyrand played the leading rôle in the memorable session of January 20. According to Bülow's dispatch of the 22nd, "The secretary of state informed us of the necessity of our occupying ourselves immediately with the basic condition for the definitive pacification of Belgium. To this end he proposed to fix the boundaries in the spirit of the demand made by the king of the Netherlands and to guarantee perpetual neutrality for Belgium as well as the integrity and inviolability of her territory."[23]

A study of the aims and motives of the Five Powers furnishes further evidence of the error in attributing the idea and, more especially, the merits of the solution of the Belgian problem to Talleyrand. In its essentials, the plan finally adopted by the powers was again assuredly not Talleyrand's but one evolved by Palmerston and the others. According to the Belgian historian, Lannoy, "La neutralité belge était donc une mesure de garantie contre la France et elle n'avait pas d'autre signification".[24] That this would be radically different from the plan advocated by Talleyrand, who would naturally seek the interests of France, is evi-

[22] F. O., S. P. 64/165.

[23] Bülow to the king, Jan. 22, 1831, Geh. Staatsarch. Ausw. Amt, Rep. I. England, no. 86.

[24] Lannoy, p. 126.

dent. He insisted upon a loose federal state, including Luxemburg, with Antwerp and Ostend as semi-independent 'Hanseatic' towns. In his letter of January 16 to Sébastiani, cited above, he not only outlines the federal plan but goes on to explain how France would profit by such an arrangement. "It would be easy", he said, "under this organization (in Belgium) so to promote (ménager) the interests of France, and . . . if war should come, Belgium would be more ready to unite with us than under any other system." Ten days later, he was even more explicit. "No one", he said, "would be inclined to deny that the reunion of Belgium with France would offer advantages to France, although an expansion of our frontiers on the Rhine would be more in accord with my ideas on French policy." [25] "La Belgique nous viendra peut-être, mais plus tard. . . . La force des choses la mène à la France".[26] To Madame Adelaide, the king's sister, he wrote: "The future will doubtless bring us its annexation and I believe we can expect it without paying so high a price." In the meantime, "If France had any need to extend her frontier, she should look towards the Rhine, it is there that her real interest lies, and where she will gain real power and acquire a useful frontier, but just now, peace is worth far more than all this to us. Belgium would bring us more trouble than profit, and the latter has been pretty well secured to us by her neutrality." [27] Belgium would be, he pointed out, on the same basis as Switzerland; the political system set up in 1815 would be set aside; thirteen fortresses hitherto maintained against France and a menace to her northern frontier, would be abandoned.

In accordance with his ambitious program looking toward the ultimate partition of Belgium, he nearly wrecked the plan for a united Belgium in the long session of the conference on January 20. Palmerston in a confidential dispatch to Granville wrote on January 21:

> He fought like a dragon, pretended he would not agree to the neutrality of Belgium if Luxembourg were not included, then said he would accept instead of it the cession to France of Philippeville and Marienburg. . . . At last we brought him to terms by the same means by which juries become unanimous—by starving. Between nine and ten at night he agreed to what we proposed, being, I have no doubt, secretly delighted to have got the neutrality of Belgium established.[28]

[25] Talleyrand to Sébastiani, Jan. 25, 1831, *Corr. de Talleyrand*, IV. 187–188.

[26] Talleyrand, *Mémoires*, IV. 106.

[27] Talleyrand to Madame Adelaide, Jan. 24, 1831, *Nouvelle Revue rétrospective*, XV. 354; *Memoirs*, IV. 322. Broglie in the *Memoirs* suppressed the latter part of the letter. As Lannoy suggests, it is almost too revealing as to Talleyrand's secret *idées*, Lannoy, p. 133, n. 1.

[28] Palmerston to Granville, January 21, 1831, Bulwer, II. 30–31. *Cf.* also Palmerston to Granville Jan. 7, 1831, *ibid.*, pp. 27–28. The version given by Broglie in Talleyrand's *Memoirs* is stronger. For example, "Talleyrand fought like a lion over this; he

Nor did he abandon the struggle for a division of Belgium after the adoption of the protocol of January 20, and its formal indorsement by him on behalf of the French government on April 17. As late as August 26, Palmerston complained to Granville, "*Talleyrand has for some time past been preaching to all who would listen to him the necessity of partitioning Belgium* . . . he put up Alexander Baring the other day to broach this doctrine in the House of Commons." [29]

Manifestly the legend that Talleyrand originated the plan for Belgian neutrality, that he carried it through against all obstacles, and that he cleverly led the others without their knowing it, is utterly without foundation in fact.[30] During the conference a cartoon appeared which greatly angered Palmerston. It represented the foreign secretary being carried on the back of a paralytic (Talleyrand) with the legend *The Lame leading the Blind.* In Parliament Palmerston was repeatedly attacked for having been outwitted by that "able and experienced man (Talleyrand) who . . . to all the acquirements of age and experience added all the freshness and vigour of youth", and who, "was rather an overmatch for him in negotiations". As we have seen, Palmerston, although much irritated and perplexed at times, was nevertheless fairly well in command of the situation throughout.[31] Moreover he and the

declared he would not consent to the neutrality of Belgium, would have nothing to do with this neutrality and ended by saying that he wanted Philippeville and Marienburg in exchange. . . ."

[29] Palmerston to Granville, Aug. 26, 1831; *ibid.*, II. 122–123. *Cf.* Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates,* XI. (Mar. 26, 1832) 921.

[30] The thesis has been attacked by Hampe, Lannoy, and others but without much of the evidence here presented.

[31] Palmerston saw clearly the check to French and Belgian chauvinism in the action of the conference on Belgian neutrality. But as the following letter to Granville shows, he also realized the advantages to France and saw to it that they were impressed upon Sébastiani and the king.

F. O. January 21, 1831.

Dft.
Viscount Granville
No. 17. *Confidential*
My Lord:

France ought to feel the great advantages which this arrangement confers upon Her. By one stroke of the pen, the whole line of Belgick fortresses, so far as they constituted points of attack upon her territory, at once disappear; and this upon a Frontier the nearest to her Capital, and the least protected by defences of nature or of art. England voluntarily interdicts Herself, in the event of war with France, from the point of departure for her military operations, which is the nearest and most convenient to her Coast; while the Northern Powers of Europe, of their own accord, close that door through which they would naturally approach the French frontier in the event of hostilities leading them there. France ought therefore to see in this Protocol the most

representatives of the Four Powers had a unique opportunity to develop their plans without Talleyrand in the frequent discussions on the barrier fortress question, which they regarded as belonging exclusively to themselves to the exclusion of France—"Qu'il appartient uniquement à nos cours à l'exclusion de celle de la France".[32]

The final incorporation of neutralization in the treaties of 1831 and 1839 has been noted above. From the beginning it was closely linked up with the fear of revolutionary elements, the threat of the union of France and Belgium, the controversy over the choice of a king, the problem of the border fortresses, the status of Luxemburg, the apportionment of the debt, and the stubbornness of the Dutch, which brought French intervention and a British blockade of the Scheldt. Contemporary interest as reflected in the press and discussions in Parliament soon lagged and the public paid relatively little attention to the neutrality provisions of the treaties.

Long before the final agreement was reached in 1839, however, the question as to how the neutrality imposed upon Belgium affected her liberty of action in commercial matters gave rise to bitter controversy. Following tentative overtures from Prussia for a union of Belgium with the Prussian commercial system, French statesmen, with the active support of King Leopold, inaugurated a vigorous campaign for a Franco-Belgian customs union. The negotiations, which extended over a period of seven years, led at times to vigorous protests and even to a threat of war.[33]

Throughout the controversy the Four Powers insisted that political neutrality also involved commercial neutrality. Palmerston in par-

signal and unequivocal proofs of the pacifick spirit which animates the other Powers of Europe; and it is to be hoped that this instrument will prove the pledge of uninterrupted harmony and unbroken peace.

(Signed) Palmerston

Confidential Draft to Viscount Granville, F. O., S. P., France 27/424.

[32] Bülow to the king, Jan. 29, 1831, Geh. Staatsarch. Ausw. Amt, Rep. I., England, no. 86. *Cf.* also F. O., S. P. 27/438 (Apr. 18, 1831).

[33] The story of this episode has recently been admirably told by Alfred De Ridder in *Les projets d'union douanière franco-belge et les puissances européennes, 1836–1843* (Brussels, 1933). The volume represents the results of his researches in connection with the preparation of a *dossier* on the subject for the Belgian foreign office similar to his *La crise de la neutralité belge de 1848: Le dossier diplomatique*, published in 1928 by the Commission royale d'Histoire. The Prussian Archives tell a slightly different story but discussion of this question, as well as a more detailed study of Belgian neutrality, must be deferred till the fuller treatment now in preparation by the writer in collaboration with Mr. Daniel H. Thomas.

ticular insisted upon this. To Sir Hamilton Seymour in Brussels he gave specific instructions to make energetic protests against the project. It would, he pointed out, not only vitiate the treaties of 1831 and 1839, but carry with it the "political suicide" of Belgium.[34] Every union of a commercial nature will of necessity, he declared, tend to common action politically. Moreover when such a community of interest is established between a large and a small power, the will of the larger is bound to prevail, and the smaller is likely to lose its independence. The avowed object of the powers who established the separation of Belgium from Holland was to make Belgium independent.

A strong note of warning, which reflected the attitude of the English cabinet to the proposed union, is expressed in a letter of October 16, 1840, by the Belgian minister in London, Van de Weyer, as follows:

> If Belgium shows so little concern for her political independence as to sacrifice it to industrial and commercial interests which could be served equally well otherwise, the other powers will show themselves more jealous and make us understand our duties toward ourselves and toward Europe. Never will they permit a reunion disguised under the form of a commercial treaty and a customs union. Let France not forget her own protest at the time when the question was being agitated in Belgium as to whether it would not be to our interests to associate ourselves commercially with Germany.[35]

Throughout the controversy, Prussia vigorously supported the British position; Bülow insisted that the London Conference be reconvened. Austria was more lukewarm, largely because of a lack of immediate interest and Metternich's desire to avoid trouble, although he, too, finally fell in line and supported England in her protests at Paris. In his instructions to Baron Neumann, dated November 23, 1842, he suggested that Aberdeen base the opposition of the Allied courts on two theses: First, that customs unions were incompatible with the political independence of states, and second, that such a union between France and Belgium would be altogether out of accord with the spirit behind the separation of Belgium and Holland and would therefore destroy the guarantee which the powers of the London Conference had set up. In accordance with this encouragement, and in line with the policy laid down by Palmerston, Lord Aberdeen sent an identical note to the courts of Vienna, Berlin, and St. Petersburg on October 28, 1842.

After reviewing Palmerston's position and stressing the fact that in the 11th protocol of the London Conference, all the powers, including

[34] Palmerston to Seymour, Sept. 11, 1840.

[35] De Ridder, *Les projets d'union douanière*, p. 32.

France, had pledged themselves not to seek "any augmentation of territory, any exclusive influence, any separate advantage", he said, "the proposed union" is therefore out of accord with the written engagements of France toward the other powers and the powers will be "justified in protesting against it", as it violated both the neutrality and the independence of Belgium. While no one would deny the right of Belgium to enter into commercial treaties, the peculiar character of the proposed union, he said further, would deprive her of the independence to make such commercial arrangements with other states, "without the previous sanction of a more powerful neighbor and would violate her neutrality by conferring such exclusive advantages upon a single power". He then drew attention to the ulterior political motives of France as revealed by the reception of the project in the French press, "which loudly proclaimed that France would be fully indemnified for the economic sacrifice the Customs Union would involve, by the political ascendency in Belgium such a union would confer upon her".[36]

While this was going on, another threat to the status of Belgium as established by the treaties occurred. It arose in 1840 out of French indignation over the diplomatic defeat in the Mehemet Ali affair. In his effort to save his face at home, Thiers became very belligerent; he declared the treaties of 1814 and 1815 no longer adequate, and threatened to demand the so-called natural frontier of the Rhine. Considerable anxiety and much excitement prevailed. England made formal protest at Brussels on behalf of the powers while across the Rhine in the Germanies the warlike enthusiasm aroused by the threat produced the first semblance of nationalism since the War of Liberation and gave to Germany her three most popular national songs.

In 1848 the revolution in France suddenly aroused all the fears and expectations in regard to the neutrality of Belgium which had been more or less dormant for some years. The July Monarchy never had given up the Talleyrand thesis that neutrality was a temporary condition leaving the way open for French domination when the favorable opportunity arose. To the efforts at political control through an economic union Louis Philippe had added a vague sort of claim to supervision over the direction of Belgian foreign affairs, showing considerable irritation at times when Brussels assumed to act independently.[37] The fear that the February Revolution would spread to Belgium was therefore very real. The Belgian government at once inaugurated a meticulous ob-

[36] Oct. 28, 1842. F. O., S. P. 120/203.

[37] *Cf.* letter of the Prince de Ligne to M. Van Praet, the king's secretary, of July 17, 1843, *Souvenirs de la princesse de Ligne* (Brussels, 1923), pp. 230–233.

servance of neutrality obligations. It even disavowed its minister in London for making inquiry as to British assistance in case of an attack by the Republic. The abortive invasion by a handful of French joined by a small group of Belgians, was defeated at the hamlet of Risquons-Tout and the crisis was past.

With the election of Louis Napoleon to the presidency of the French republic, a new and convinced advocate of French expansion in the northeast came to power. According to the historians of the Second Empire, Napoleon had prepared a decree for the formal annexation of Belgium to be proclaimed on the day following the *coup d' état* of December 2, 1851.[38] The decree was, however, suppressed at the last moment. The same disregard for the treaties appeared in the effort to impinge upon Belgian neutrality in connection with the Crimean War, when, in 1855, both England and France brought diplomatic pressure to bear to induce Belgium to join them in the war against Russia.[39] With the consolidation of the power of Napoleon III., French pressure for expansion toward the Rhine and the annexation of Belgium increased. Discussing the annexationist plans attributed to the emperor, Ollivier dismisses them all save those in regard to Belgium. "A l'égard de la Belgique il aurait pu être plus accessible à l'ambition. Il la considérait comme une création artificielle dirigée contre notre grandeur et qui n'avait droit à aucune inviolabilité."[40] The success of the emperor's policy in the annexation of Savoy and Nice at the expense of Italy supplied an excellent precedent. Why not make the price of his neutrality, if not his active coöperation in the unification of Germany, the acquisition by France of the much coveted territory on the eastern frontier? It seemed reasonable and possible. Both the press and the literature of the day openly advocated the policy. With the outbreak of the Austro-Prussian War the favorable opportunity seemed to have arrived. But the emperor did not act with sufficient dispatch. The war came to a sudden and unexpected end after the Prussian victory at Sadowa in July, 1866, and Bismarck, flushed with victory, was not in a mood to make concessions to Paris. Nevertheless, Napoleon made demands for territorial compensation on the Rhine in return for French acquiescence in the annexations by Prussia and the organization of the North German Confederation. It was of course refused, whereupon the emperor turned

[38] A. Debidour, *Histoire diplomatique de l'Europe*, II. 71.

[39] Éd. Descamps, *La neutralité de la Belgique, au point de vue historique, diplomatique, juridique et politique* (Brussels, 1902), pp. 590–591.

[40] Émile Ollivier, *L'Empire libéral*, III. 101.

again toward Belgium. He instructed Benedetti, his ambassador at Berlin, to act with greater vigor. For the honor of France, and more especially for the preservation of the Empire, some territorial acquisitions were believed to be essential. A plan for the annexation of Luxemburg and Belgium was developed and submitted to Bismarck in a draft treaty by Benedetti on August 20, 1866. Article IV. reads:

> On his part His Majesty, the King of Prussia, in case His Majesty the Emperor of the French should be obliged by circumstances to cause his troops to enter Belgium, or to conquer it, will grant the succor (*coöperation*) of his arms to France, and will sustain her with all his forces of land and sea against every power which, in that eventuality, should declare war upon her.[41]

Although Bismarck pigeonholed for its more effective use in 1870 the copy of the draft treaty given to him, the reference to Luxemburg again forced the status of that duchy upon the attention of Europe. On January 7, 1867, Benedetti declared to Ollivier: "Once in Luxemburg we shall be on the road to Brussels, by this route we will arrive there the more speedily." But a conference of the powers was called in 1867. Luxemburg too was neutralized and placed under the guarantee of the powers. Despite this, however, Napoleon continued to push his projects for expansion eastward. He next planned an economic union with Belgium involving the acquisition of Belgian railways, their consolidation with those of eastern France, and mutual tariff arrangements—a sort of *Anschluss*.

Nothing had come of these negotiations when the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War led Bismarck to publish the Benedetti Draft Treaty. The French text appeared in the London *Times* accompanied by an editorial expressing the belief in its authenticity and stating that it had been recently put forward again as a condition of peace.[42] Benedetti's disclaimer of authorship and the accusation that the chancellor had coöperated in the drafting of the proposals was of no avail. Bismarck promptly showed the original to the members of the diplomatic corps in Berlin. It was in Benedetti's own hand and on the official stationery

[41] *Archives diplomatiques, 1871–1872*, I. 281. "Since Sadowa, France has never ceased tempting us with offers at Germany's or Belgium's expense", said Bismarck in a circular note of July 28 and 29, 1870, to the representatives of the North German Confederation. *Cf.* Prince von Bülow, *Memoirs* (Eng. tr.), IV. 180. Dirr (Bismarck und Belgien, *München-Augsburger Abendzeitung*, 1918, nos. 97, 98, 99), says Napoleon wrote in the margin of the copy of the draft treaty submitted to him: "It is clear that the extension of Prussian dominance in Germany beyond the Main must be for us a natural almost compulsory opportunity, to make ourselves masters of Belgium."

[42] London *Times*, July 25, 1870, pp. 8–9. The copy in the *Times* is not, as is sometimes claimed, a facsimile.

of the French embassy.[43] There was therefore no reason to doubt Bismarck's statement that Benedetti drew the complete treaty from his pocket.

The dangers to Belgian neutrality upon the outbreak of the war led Gladstone with his keen sense for realities, to take steps to secure its maintenance by separate treaties. Notes to Paris and Berlin asked for assurances that the belligerents respect the neutrality pledges. Two *ad hoc* treaties were signed, the belligerents binding themselves not to disturb the neutrality of Belgium for the duration of the war and for twelve months thereafter.

Why did Gladstone secure these bilateral treaties, when the neutrality of Belgium was already guaranteed by the powers in the treaty of 1839? His answer at the time, and again more explicitly in 1872, reflects the doubt in the minds of the signatory powers as to the binding nature of the guarantee. On August 10, 1870, he told the Commons that he could not subscribe to the belief that the existence of a guarantee was binding upon every party to it regardless of particular circumstances existing at the time when the need for action upon the guarantee arose, that Lords Aberdeen and Palmerston had not taken that "impracticable" view of a guarantee. The existing guarantee was of necessity important, and a weighty element in the case, but the difference between the treaties of 1839 and those of 1870, he said, lay in the fact that

> . . . in accordance with our obligations, we should have had to act under the Treaty of 1839 without any stipulated assurance of being supported from any quarter whatever against any combination, however formidable; whereas by the Treaty now formally before Parliament, under the conditions laid down in it, we secure powerful support in the event of our having to act—a support with respect to which we may well say that it brings the object in view within the sphere of the practicable and attainable. . . .[44]

The contradiction between action "in accordance with our obligations" under the treaty of 1839, and his refusal to subscribe to the belief that the existence of a guarantee was binding on every party to it, regardless of particular circumstances, is explained in a speech against a motion to withdraw England from all obligations to intervene by force of arms in the affairs of another nation, in which he said:

> I have often heard Lord Palmerston give his opinion of guarantees both in this House and elsewhere; and it was a familiar phrase of his, which, I

[43] *Archives diplomatiques, 1871–1872*, I. 281, where a facsimile from a German source of the draft treaty accompanies the letter of July 26, 1870, by Loftus in Berlin to Granville in Paris.

[44] Hansard, CCIII. (Aug. 10, 1870) 1787–1789.

think, others must recollect as well as myself, that while a guarantee gave a right of interference it did not constitute of itself an obligation to interfere.[45]

This opportunist interpretation of the obligations of the guaranteeing powers was in direct opposition to the opinion expressed by the law officers at the time. They said:

> We are of the opinion that, if the Treaty is to be construed by the rules which govern the construction of contracts by the law of this country, the guarantee is a joint one. . . . The term joint-guarantee by no means imports that the guarantee of each is conditional on all the others performing their contract, and that upon one or more refusing to do so the others are released. No such construction would be placed on any guarantee, unless such an intention were clearly expressed in it.
>
> Applying these rules of our municipal law (which we believe to be substantially in accordance in this respect with that of most civilized countries), we reply . . . that the refusal or incapacity of one or more of the guaranteeing Powers to act does not, in our opinion, liberate the remaining Powers from the obligation to do so.[46]

That Gladstone's position was in perfect accord with Palmerston's appears clearly from the remarks by the latter in the session of the Commons on June 8, 1855. Speaking to a proposal by Disraeli for the neutralization of the Balkan states, he said:

> There certainly are instances in Europe of such propositions, and it has been agreed by treaty that Belgium and Switzerland should be declared neutral; but I am not disposed to attach very much importance to such engagements, for the history of the world shows that when a quarrel arises, and a nation makes war, and thinks it advantageous to traverse with its army such neutral territory, the declarations of neutrality are not apt to be very religiously respected.[47]

This was also the view freely expressed in influential quarters in France. The *Moniteur diplomatique* of March 11, 1869, said:

> It is false to hold that Belgian neutrality would be incompatible with the passage of French forces across her territory. The most authoritative publicists admit that neutral states are privileged to grant the right of passage across their territory to the military forces of foreign states.

The French war department developed a mobilization plan along these lines. Upon the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, the belief that France in the case of victory would annex Belgium was fairly general. Both Bismarck and Disraeli openly expressed themselves to

[45] *Ibid.*, CCX. (Apr. 12, 1872) 1178.

[46] *British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898–1914,* edited by G. P. Gooch and Harold Temperley, VIII. (*Arbitration, Neutrality and Security,* 1932) 378.

[47] Hansard, CXXXVIII. (June 8, 1855) 1748.

this effect[48] and it was in part to make this clear that Bismarck published Benedetti's alliance proposal.

During the Boulanger Crisis in 1886–1887, the dangers of the violation of Belgian neutrality again came up for serious discussion. In this instance an overwhelming body of English opinion, official as well as popular, held that England was under no obligation to intervene if Belgian neutrality were violated.[49] Lord Vivian, the British minister in Brussels, at first and apparently without instructions, assured the Belgian government in January, 1887, that "'Belgium might count upon England in case of war'", but later in the year, he was more guarded, suggesting that Belgium prepare as if she had to act alone. A similar *volte face* was made by the British minister in Vienna, Sir Augustus Paget. After assuring his Belgian colleague that Belgium could count upon England in case of war, he later told him that England "'was not bound to defend our [Belgian] neutrality if the other Great Powers remained inactive. Belgium would do well to look to her defence herself.'"[50]

This change in front is clearly brought out in an extensive discussion in the public press. It began with a series of articles by Sir Charles Dilke in the *Fortnightly Review* of 1887.[51] The *Standard* followed with a letter signed "Diplomaticus" (presumably Alfred Austin) in which this leading Conservative journal vigorously opposed the idea of military intervention in the case of the violation of Belgian neutrality. As to England's honor and her pledges under the treaties, "her Foreign Minister ought to be equal to the task of meeting this objection without committing her to war".[52]

An article in the same journal argues the case quite in the manner of Napoleon III. and the article in the *Moniteur diplomatique* in 1869, or, for that matter, of the Germans in 1914, particularly with reference to the difference between a right of way and annexation. It says:

> There is all the difference in the world between the momentary use of a "right of way", even if the use of a right of way be, in a sense, wrongful, and the appropriation of the ground covered by the right of way. . . . England does not wish to shirk its true responsibilities. But it would be madness for

[48] *Cf.* Heinrich von Sybel, *Founding of the German Empire*, etc., Eng. Tr. (New York, 1890–1898), VII. 451–452.

[49] *Cf.* G. P. Gooch, *History of Modern Europe, 1878–1919*, pp. 134–135.

[50] John S. Ewart, *Roots and Causes of the Wars, 1914–1918* (New York, 1925) I. 439, 440, 442.

[51] *Fortnightly Review*, vol. XLI., Jan. to Mar., six long articles.

[52] Lady Gwendolen Cecil, *Life of Robert Marquis of Salisbury*, IV. 58.

us to incur or assume responsibilities unnecessarily, when to do so would manifestly involve our participation in a tremendous war.[53]

It is difficult to say how far these views represented the opinions of the ministry. There is a frank presentation of the evidence on the subject in the British diplomatic documents in which it appears clear that Lord Vivian in Brussels could get no official support for his assurances to the Belgians that the press views did not represent British official opinion.[54] Of course the government would not make its attitude known publicly. Nevertheless, the irritation of the prime minister, Lord Salisbury, over French policies in other quarters is well known. On February 5, the day after the *Diplomaticus* letter appeared, he wrote to Lord Lyons: "The French are inexplicable. . . . It is very difficult to prevent oneself from wishing for another Franco-German war to put a stop to this incessant vexation."[55] The press of both parties vigorously supported nonintervention and even the "no guarantee" thesis. The *Spectator* argued that England could not bar the traversing of Belgian soil. "Our guarantee for her is not a solitary one, and would not bind us to fight alone; but there are general interests to be considered. The probability is that we shall insist on her not becoming a theatre of war, but shall not bar—as, indeed, we cannot bar—the traversing of her soil."[56] The *Morning Post* thought that although England should "protest against a violation of Belgian territory", she should be satisfied with the assurance that at the end of the war that territory should remain intact. Stead, in the *Pall Mall Gazette,* claimed that the Treaty of 1839 involved no obligation for military aid. "There is, therefore, no English guarantee of Belgium."[57]

On the basis of these discussions it was claimed during the war that the English government had decided in 1887 not to oppose the violation of Belgian neutrality, provided that assurances were given that all damage would be paid for. To this the foreign office issued a formal *démenti* in 1917. For the government to have come to a definite decision would, moreover, have been quite un-English, determining Great Britain's attitude on a possible rather than an actual case.

Down to 1870 English defense of Belgian neutrality was directed against her traditional enemy, France. During the following decade,

[53] Mar. 11, 1869.

[54] *British Documents,* VIII. 371–374.

[55] Salisbury to Lyons, Feb. 5, 1887, Cecil, IV. 29–30.

[56] *Spectator,* Feb. 5, 1887.

[57] Ewart, I. 435–436. *Pall Mall Gazette,* Feb. 4, 1887.

the situation changed a great deal. Although France still continued to be England's chief rival, Germany gradually appeared as the power most likely to become the aggressor in that quarter. With the formation of the Entente Cordiale in 1904, the knowledge of the Schlieffen Plan, and the beginning of Anglo-German naval rivalry, a radical shift in the position of the powers in relation to the neutrality of Belgium occurred. This in turn brought about a reorientation of England's policy on the subject. In answer to Sir Edward Grey's question, put to the foreign office, as to England's liability under the treaty guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium, first in the case Belgium acquiesced in a violation of her neutrality, and second, if the other guaranteeing powers, or some of them, acquiesced, Eyre Crowe replied:

> Great Britain is liable for the maintenance of Belgian neutrality whenever either Belgium or any other of the guaranteeing powers are in need of, and demand, assistance in opposing its violation.[58]

In the discussions of Belgian neutrality by the committee on imperial defense on April 25, 1912, Lord Haldane said the only case in which there seemed to be any question in the mind of the committee as to the obligation to come to its defense, was that in which Belgium herself "adopted an attitude of neutrality, but refrained from attempting to enforce respect for her attitude". To which Mr. Winston Churchill, then first lord of the admiralty, replied: "It would be a great pity if we had to rescue Belgium against her will".[59] It is a far cry from this interpretation of neutrality to that entertained by Palmerston and later by Gladstone and Salisbury. The two views are somewhat contradictory to say the least. With the appearance of Germany as a serious threat to Belgian independence and neutrality, the second view gained ground steadily, and became associated with the same motives of self protection and of commercial and naval supremacy as of old. In 1906, Colonel Repington of the foreign office asked Major Huguet, the French military attaché in London: "Do the French realize that any violation of Belgian neutrality brings us into the field automatically in defense of our Treaty obligations?" The answer is very characteristic: "La France l'a toujours supposé, mais n'en a jamais eu l'assurance officielle."[60]

In 1909, Mr. Renwick inquired in the Commons "whether this coun-

[58] The arguments advanced by Crowe are set forth at considerable length in a memorandum of November 15, 1908, *British Documents*, VIII. 375–377.

[59] *Ibid.*, pp. 397–398.

[60] C. à Court Repington, *The First World War, 1914–1918*, I. 8.

try is still under an obligation by treaty to maintain the integrity of Belgium?" The undersecretary of state for foreign affairs replied:

> The treaties signed in London on 19th April, 1839, under which Great Britain, together with Austria, France, Prussia, and Russia, guarantee the independence and neutrality of Belgium are still in force.[61]

Throughout the years 1905 to 1911, important conversations between the responsible military chiefs of Great Britain and Belgium were going on. In an informal way these had the sanction of the heads of the respective foreign offices and of the war departments, though not known to other members of the cabinets, save in a few cases and, of course, not to the parliaments. Plans for the mobilization and concentration of the fighting forces were worked out in great detail on the basis of the active coöperation between the British, Belgian, and French armies.[62]

The bearing of this on the status of Belgian neutrality has been widely discussed. Paléologue in his diary claims that the knowledge of the Schlieffen Plan brought to the French Intelligence Department in 1904 by an unknown person (*Vengeur*), presumably a member of the German general staff, drove England and France from 1905 on to carry on negotiations with the Belgians to meet it.[63] Certainly the military authorities of the Allies took the coöperation of the Belgians on their left flank for granted during these years, despite a certain aloofness after the dispute over the Congo, on the part of certain members of the Belgian cabinet, including Baron la Brogueville, the prime minister, and the minister of war, General Michel. It is not without interest that upon their entry into Belgian territory the Germans sought to base their action on much the same reasons which had been so strongly urged in influential French circles in 1870 and 1880 and had received such a favorable reception in the British press in 1887. They asked for a right of way and proposed to make good the damage done after the war was over. But the distinction between asserting a right of way and actual occupation and annexation as violations of Belgian neutrality made no appeal

[61] *Parliamentary Debates*, 1909, II. 323.

[62] To the evidence of the German publication, *Belgische Dokumente zum Kriegsausbruch* and Minutes of the Meetings of the French and Russian chiefs-of-staff, published by Marchand in *Le Livre Noir*, there is now added that of the *British Documents*, of the *Documents diplomatiques français*, and a considerable body of unofficial, but contemporary evidence, mostly by participants.

[63] For a searching critical review of this thesis see Wolfgang Foerster, *Berliner Monatshefte*, X. (Nov., 1932) 1053–1067. *Cf.* also *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVIII. (Apr., 1933) 629–630.

to the world at large. The idea of the moral force—"force morale"—referred to by Esterhazy in his report on the session of January 20, 1831, of the London Conference, was more in accord with the trend of world opinion in August, 1914, and it quickly became the most powerful factor in turning neutral opinion against Germany. As Palmerston told the Commons in 1829, "There is in nature no moving force but mind, all else is passive and inert . . . in political affairs it is public opinion". On the present status of Belgian neutrality the prediction by the Belgian statesman, Banning, in 1848 is most suggestive—*Vaincus ou vanqueurs avec la France contre l'Allemagne ou avec l'Allemagne contre la France, nous ne pouvons plus être neutres après.*

WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH.

The University of Pennsylvania.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

The Introduction of Phrenology to the United States

Among the many medical novelties of the Nineteenth Century none is more interesting than phrenology, which received its first considerable interest in the United States during the eighteen thirties. It is a curious incident in the social history of that decade. In origin it was distinctly medical—its originators being the doctors François Joseph Gall and John Gaspar Spurzheim, who did the greater part of their work in the first two decades of the century.[1] With Gall's death in 1828, Spurzheim was recognized as the outstanding authority. Little interest in the movement was evinced in the United States until it was championed by one of the best known of Western physicians—Dr. Charles Caldwell of the medical school of Transylvania. Caldwell was scholarly and an able lecturer, but pompous and conceited. He was primarily a theorist and popularizer, having no personal medical practice for half a century and doing no important writing. For a quarter of a century after 1821 he was the most eminent phrenologist in the United States, often being called "the American Spurzheim". He was a prolific speaker and writer —always vigorous, but frequently coarsely vituperative.[2]

Some of the tenets of phrenology are evident even to-day, but three characteristics of the early movement are worth statement. First, contrary to common belief, phrenology did not originate as the scheme of money-making fakers, but from the study of able men using the best scientific methods of their day. Conclusions were drawn only after long and painstaking researches. Second, the work and theories of the phrenologists were by no means confined to the bumps of the head, as

[1] R. W. Haskins, *History and Progress of Phrenology* (Buffalo, 1839); J. G. Spurzheim, *Phrenology in connection with the Study of Physiognomy* (Boston, 1836), pp. 12–130; Nahum Capen, *Reminiscences of Dr. Spurzheim and George Combe* (New York, 1881).

[2] George Combe, *Lectures on Phrenology* (New York, 1873), pp. 79–80; Frances Trollope, *Domestic Manners of the Americans* (New York, 1927), pp. 92–93; New York *Evening Post*, Apr. 16, 1838; Haskins, pp. 105–115; Charles Caldwell, *Correspondence between Dr. Charles Caldwell and Dr. James Fishbach* (Lexington, 1826); *id., Elements of Phrenology* (Lexington, 1824); *id., Phrenology Vindicated and Anti-Phrenology Unmasked* (New York, 1838); *id.*, Phrenology Vindicated, in *Annals of Phrenology*, I. (Oct., 1833) 1–102; *id., Phrenology Vindicated in a Series of Remarks . . .* (Lexington, 1835); *id., Thoughts on the True Connexion of Phrenology and Religion* (Louisville, 1839); *id., Thoughts on the True Mode of improving the Condition of Man* (Lexington, 1833).

is often assumed. In diagnosing any individual their first interest was in his general physical characteristics, such as height, weight, and texture of the skin. In respect to the brain, they concluded from considerable evidence that it was not a unitary organ but was composed of a limited and ascertainable number of relatively independent faculties. This general viewpoint is still current in spite of recent attacks upon it. The troubles of the phrenologists came largely because they thought of these organs in too small and specific terms, located them too exactly, and held that their relative development could be determined from the outside of the skull. Third, the phrenologists undoubtedly had a liberalizing effect in many fields by their belief that mental or emotional defects could better be overcome by cultivating proper attitudes and organs rather than by punishing or suppressing the undesired trait. Such a belief was of obvious importance in many fields such as education and penology.[3]

Phrenology received some attention because of the work of Dr. Caldwell, but its first great impetus came with the visit of Dr. Spurzheim to the United States in 1832.[4] Arriving in New York, Spurzheim moved to Boston by easy stages, lecturing, dissecting, collecting specimens, and in general making an excellent impression. The *Boston Medical Journal* notes that the Spurzheim lectures "attract crowded and delighted audiences", and adds further that "we believe that the efforts of Dr. S. will form among us a new era in education, and open, to the minds of the most intelligent, new and correct views of their moral and intellectual powers, and the best means of cultivating them all, in the most rational and successful manner".[5] Interest was widespread, and comments were

[3] R. E. Riegel, Early Phrenology in the United States, in *Medical Life*, XXXVII. (July, 1930) 361–376. Among contemporary American accounts are Frederick Coombs, *Popular Phrenology* (New York, 1848); A. Dean, *Lectures on Phrenology* (Albany, 1834); L. N. Fowler, *The Principles of Phrenology and Physiology* (New York, 1842); O. S. Fowler, *Fowler on Memory* (New York, 1842); *id., Phrenology and Physiology* (New York, 1843); *id., Fowler on Matrimony* (New York, 1842); *id., The Christian Phrenologist* (Cazenovia, 1843); *id., Phrenology versus Intemperance* (Philadelphia, 1841); *id., Practical Phrenology* (Philadelphia, 1840); O. S. and L. N. Fowler, *Phrenology Proved* (Philadelphia, 1839); F. H. Hamilton, *Lecture on Phrenology* (Rochester, 1841); William Ingalls, *A Lecture on the Subject of Phrenology* (Boston, 1839); Silas Jones, *Practical Phrenology* (Boston, 1836); R. Macnish, *An Introduction to Phrenology* (Boston, 1836); Mrs. L. Miles, *Phrenology* (Philadelphia, 1835); Joshua Toulmin Smith, *Synopsis of Phrenology* (Boston, 1838); J. A. Warne, *Phrenology in the Family* (Philadelphia, 1839); *Ladies' Magazine*, VI. (Jan., 1833) 24–27; *Analectic Magazine*, VI. (July, 1815) 63–69, an early account and cited in Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines, 1741–1850* (New York, 1930), p. 152.

[4] He gives his reasons in Spurzheim, *Phrenology and Physiognomy*, pp. 107–108.

[5] *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal*, VII. (Oct. 17, 1832) 162.

generally favorable,[6] even though there was a minor element of disbelief, as in the case of the writer of "Boston Notions", a poem which began:

> Great man of skulls! I must let loose
> My pen against you;—more's the pity,
> For surely you have played the deuce
> Among the noddles of the city.
> I wo'n't malignantly assail
> Your fame, and say you mean to joke us;
> But faith, I can't make head or tail
> Of all this mystic hocus pocus.[7]

The untimely death of Spurzheim at Boston in 1832 gave an added impetus to the movement. The attitude toward Spurzheim may be estimated by the fact that the funeral committee included Josiah Quincy, president of Harvard, H. G. Otis, Nathaniel Bowditch, Joseph Story, and Joseph Tuckerman; the Boston Medical Association attended the funeral in a body, and Dr. Charles Follen of Harvard gave the funeral discourse.[8] Popular interest in phrenology was vastly increased,[9] and the *American Journal of Medicine* was not alone in feeling that "The prophet is gone, but his mantle is upon us".[10]

A new peak of phrenological interest came in 1838–1840 with the visit of George Combe, who was the world's outstanding phrenologist after the death of Spurzheim. Combe lectured pleasingly to large and enthusiastic audiences throughout the eastern half of the United States, and also found time to contract many personal friendships with prominent people and to do an immense amount of sightseeing. His visit produced what was probably the greatest peak of interest by the United States in phrenology.[11]

[6] Spurzheim, *Phrenology and Physiognomy*, pp. 110–145; George Combe, *Notes on the United States of North America* (Philadelphia, 1841), I. 59; *Ladies' Mag.*, V. (Oct., 1832) 474; *New England Magazine*, IV. (Jan., 1833) 40–47; Boston *Atlas* as quoted in New York *Evening Post*, Nov. 14, 1832; *American Phrenological Journal*, II. (Jan., 1839) 120; *Annals of Phren.*, I. (Sept., 1834) 272.

[7] *New Eng. Mag.*, III. (Oct., 1832) 397.

[8] *Boston Med. Jour.*, VII. (Nov. 14, 1832) 225–227.

[9] Thomas L. Nichols, *Forty Years of American Life* (London, 1874), p. 32; Harriet Martineau, *Retrospect of Western Travel* (New York, 1838), II. 188–189; *Boston Med. Jour.*, VII. (Jan. 9, 1833) 353. Among the Spurzheim books published in the United States were *The Anatomy of the Brain* (Boston, 1834), *Examination of the Objections made in Britain* (Boston, 1833), *Outlines of Phrenology* (Boston, 1832), *Philosophical Catechism* (Boston, 1835), and *Phrenology* (Boston, 1832). Gall's great work was reprinted as *On the Functions of the Brain and Each of its Parts* (Boston, 1835).

[10] *American Journal of Medicine*, XII. (Aug., 1833) 473–477.

[11] Combe, *Notes* gives the author's experiences in the United States; N. Y. *Evening Post*, Nov. 17, 1838, and Apr. 13, 1839; *Boston Medical Journal*, XIX. (Oct. 17 and Nov. 14, 1838) 177–178, 240–241; XXI. (Jan. 22, 1840) 387–388; *Am. Phren. Jour.*, I.

By the latter thirties the new science was well accepted, both by laymen and by doctors. Among the prominent lay sympathizers were Nicholas Biddle, the banker, an early convert; Timothy Flint, the Western author; Henry Schoolcraft, Western explorer and ethnologist; Henry Ward Beecher, who joined the Cincinnati phrenological society;[12] Horace Mann, the educator, who was a personal friend of Combe;[13] Silas Jones, who became principal of the New York institution for the blind in 1836; and R. D. Owen.[14] At least interested were such men as Abbott Lawrence, John Pickering, Josiah Quincy, Rembrandt Peale, A. D. Bache, William Gibson, O. W. Richards, T. H. Gallaudet, Benjamin Silliman.[15] Among the better known doctors who favored phrenology were Dr. Caldwell, already mentioned; Dr. J. C. Warren, the best known of Boston surgeons, who gave annual talks to the Massachusetts Medical Association on the subject; Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, who made enthusiastic speeches to the Boston phrenological society, and used the principles in his institution for the blind; Dr. Fuller, head of the Hartford Retreat for the Insane.[16] Such a list might be extended almost indefinitely.

The interest of the United States in phrenology during the thirties and early forties was expressed in hundreds of speeches and in the formation of many societies, with busts, charts, and officers. Phrenological readings were omnipresent and included such varied persons as the condemned murderer William Miller, T. D. Weld, the abolitionist, Black Hawk, the Indian chief, Joe Smith, the Mormon leader, and the youthful Clara Barton, whose mother wanted help in planning her daughter's

(1839) 125, 195–198, 200, 243; *American Journal of Science,* XXXVIII. (1840) 390–391. Among his American books are *The Constitution of Man* (Boston, 1845), *Elements of Phrenology* (Boston, 1835), *Essays on Phrenology* (Philadelphia, 1822), *On the Functions of the Cerebellum* (Boston, 1838), *Lectures on Phrenology* (New York, 1873), *A System of Phrenology* (Boston, 1834).

[12] Combe, *Notes,* I. 188; *Western Monthly Review,* III. (July, 1829) 51, (Feb., 1830) 393–402, (Mar., 1830) 444–459; Henry R. Schoolcraft, *Personal Memoirs* (Philadelphia, 1851), pp. 614–615; Nelson Sizer, *Forty Years in Phrenology* (New York, 1882), pp. 13–15; Paxton Hibben, *Henry Ward Beecher* (New York, 1927), pp. 58, 73–74.

[13] B. A. Hinsdale, *Horace Mann* (New York, 1898), pp. 94–101. Mann has been quoted as saying, "I look upon Phrenology as the guide to Philosophy, and the handmaid of Christianity. Whoever disseminates true Phrenology is a public benefactor."

[14] Combe, *Notes,* I. 142; *Boston Med. Jour.,* XV. (Aug. 24, 1836) 50; R. D. Owen, *Threading My Way* (New York, 1874), pp. 331–336.

[15] Combe, *Notes, passim.* These and others attended Combe's lectures and signed resolutions of thanks. Such action is of course not final evidence that they indorsed what Combe said.

[16] Edward Warren, *The Life of John Collins Warren, M. D.* (Boston, 1860), I. 185, II. 10–13; Combe, *Notes,* II. 164, 204–205; *Boston Med. Jour.,* XIV. (Mar. 16, 1836) 100; S. G. Howe, *An Address Delivered . . . Dec. 28th, 1835* (Boston, 1836).

life.[17] Two periodicals were published. The *Annals of Phrenology*, a Boston quarterly of which the first issue appeared in October, 1833, was a result of Spurzheim's visit, while the *American Phrenological Journal and Miscellany*, a Philadelphia monthly originating in October, 1838, can be traced to Combe's influence. In addition to these magazines, other papers and periodicals all over the country printed favorable articles.[18]

Naturally there was not unanimity in estimating the truth of phrenology. Here and there voices were raised in protest. Most widely circulated were Dr. Sewall's lectures,[19] to which Combe, Caldwell and others made lengthy replies. Sewall was actually more dogmatic and did more *a priori* reasoning than any of the better phrenologists, and no careful and dispassionate observer would have accepted his argument. Several articles in various papers tried to be humorously satiric; in most cases the humor was badly forced, as the almost inevitable example of "pumphandletiveness".[20] A number of religiously minded commentators objected vigorously to the new doctrines on the ground that they were materialistic and lessened free will.[21] More legitimate objections were raised in a number of sober articles, but often these objections were based on the most slender of evidence.[22] Practically all of the experimental evidence had been collected by the phrenologists.

The eventual discrediting of phrenology was due to several fairly obvious factors. After the passing of the early figures of the movement but little time was spent on the necessary scientific research. Later phrenologists merely accepted the masters, modifying or philosophizing about them, but not carrying on the research necessary to keep phren-

[17] *Am. Phren. Jour.*, I. (Nov., 1838) 51–61; II. (May, 1839) 272–286; C. H. Birney, *The Grimké Sisters, Sarah and Angelina Grimké* (Boston, 1885), p. 166; J. C. Bennett, *History of the Saints* (Boston, 1842), pp. 180–183; P. H. Epler, *The Life of Clara Barton* (New York, 1915), p. 18.

[18] In addition to the magazines already cited, note *Family Magazine*—several articles in 1833; *American Journal of Science*, with favorable articles in 1840; *Southern Literary Messenger*, II. (Mar., 1836) 286; *United States Democratic Review*, IX. (Nov., 1841) 462.

[19] Thomas Sewall, *An Examination of Phrenology in Two Lectures* (Washington, 1837).

[20] New York *Mirror*, XVI. (Oct. 20, 1838) 135; *Brother Jonathan*, I. (Jan. 8, 1842) 36; *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine*, VII. (Aug., 1840) 62–69; *Constellation*, II. (June 25, 1831) 252; *Morning Courier*, May 15, 20, 1835.

[21] Boston *Christian Examiner* (Nov., 1834), as quoted in Haskins, *Phrenology*, pp. 155–156; *Boston Quarterly Review*, II. (Apr., 1839) 205–229.

[22] *American Medical Intelligencer*, I. (May 15, 1837) 76–77; *American Monthly Magazine*, V. (Apr., 1838) 354–364; David Meredith Reese, *Humbugs of New-York* (New York, 1838), pp. 83–88; *Boston Med. Surg. Jour.*, XXX. (Feb. 7, 1844) 9–13, and (Mar. 13) 111–118; *American Quarterly Review*, XV. (Dec., 1836) 366–394. The last two are the best.

ology's feet upon the ground. Much time was spent in elaborating phrenological doctrines and in applying them to education, marriage, racial relations, and other problems, or in answering criticisms, particularly those of a religious nature.[23] Most notable of the elaborators of phrenology was J. S. Grimes, a brilliant but erratic man, who evolved what he called "Etherology".[24] Men like Grimes tended to weaken the movement by dividing its strength and by attaching unsupportable theories to it.

Most damaging of all was the rise of the "practical phrenologist". This practitioner, frequently without training, sought to capitalize the new science and make it pay dividends. For practical purposes, he was a fortune teller. In each new town he first gave a few lectures either free or at a nominal price, and then made his money by private readings.[25] The most notable of this group eventually created an extensive and apparently prosperous establishment in New York City.[26]

In spite of these elements of weakness, phrenology was in a very strong position in the early forties. It was generally accepted as essentially correct. An impartial observer might well have concluded that it was a coming science, with great hope for the future.

Robert E. Riegel.

Dartmouth College.

Ex-President Cleveland invited to head the Counsel for the Venezuelan Arbitration

The boundary dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela proved to be one of the major problems of President Cleveland's second administration. Cleveland and Secretary of State Olney won considerable acclaim for themselves by their aggressive and somewhat reckless action

[23] See previous citations, particularly of the Fowlers, Caldwell, and the phrenological journals. *Annals of Phren.*, I. (Sept., 1834) 264–271; *Am. Phren. Jour.*, I. (1838, 1839) 83–88, 174–177, 345–351, 373–374.

[24] Grimes lectured from 1834. He was first president of the Buffalo Phrenological Society in 1839, and in 1845 published *Etherology* (New York), an attempt to combine phrenology, hypnotism, and other factors into a universal system. E. N. Horsford, *Report on the Phrenological Classification of J. Stanley Grimes* (Albany, 1840).

[25] Joshua Toulmin Smith, *Journal in America, 1837–1838* (Metuchen, 1925), pp. 28–29; *id., Synopsis, passim.;* Sizer, *Forty Years, passim.; Western Journal of the Medical and Physical Sciences,* IX. (1835) 156–157; *Boston Med. Jour.,* XXV. (Sept. 1, 1841) 69; Combe, *Notes,* I. 84, 148; II. 17–18, 67–191.

[26] St. Louis *Commercial Bulletin,* Sept. 23, 25, Oct. 2, 1835; N. Y. *Evening Post,* Jan. 2, 1838; *Boston Med Jour.,* XVI. (July 5, 1837) 355; XXII. (July 8, 1840) 353; XXX. (Apr. 24, 1844) 247; XXXV. (Jan. 6, 1847) 482; Fowler writings, cited earlier.

in securing a settlement between the two disputants. On February 2, 1897, the ministers of Great Britain and Venezuela signed a treaty which submitted the entire question to arbitration and the United States Commission appointed by Cleveland in 1896 was able to lay aside its work of determining the correct boundary.[1] Thus an international tension which had existed for over a year was allayed.

Contrary to the general assumption that President Cleveland's work ended at this point, the Cleveland Correspondence in the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress shows that both Cleveland and Olney continued their activities even after the close of the former's administration. The case had been presented to the United States Commission by James J. Storrow, counsel for Venezuela. After the arbitration treaty had been signed Storrow accompanied Andrade home and was active in securing the ratification of the treaty by the Venezuelan congress. He then began to draft the brief which the Venezuelan government was to present to the arbitration tribunal at Paris on January 25, 1899. Storrow died on April 15, 1897.[2] Olney wrote to Cleveland on April 21, 1897,[3] concerning the untimely death of Storrow and its effect upon the Venezuelan case. He regretted Venezuela's loss but felt that the calamity was not so great since Storrow's brief was almost completed. Olney's own interest in the matter is shown by the fact that he had made arrangements to meet Andrade in Washington to ascertain what the latter proposed to do.

The Venezuelan government was determined to secure as Storrow's successor a man of influence and prestige in world affairs, who was at the same time friendly to its case, to head the counsel at Paris. Its first choice was ex-President Cleveland who had ardently supported its cause during his administration. While Andrade and Olney were discussing various plans, William L. Scruggs,[4] acting in the capacity of legal adviser to the Venezuelan government, visited Cleveland at the latter's home in Princeton, New Jersey.

Scruggs's mission was an important one. He was the bearer, not

[1] Robert M. McElroy, *Grover Cleveland, the Man and the Statesman* (New York, 1923), II. 173, 196–202. Charles Ramsdell Lingley, *Since the Civil War* (New York, 1926), pp. 372–374. Sir Julian Pauncefote was British ambassador to the United States and General José Andrade was Venezuelan minister to the United States.

[2] Appleton's *Annual Cyclopedia and Register of Important Events of the Year 1896*, XXXVI. 801; *1897*, XXVII. 621; *1899*, XXXIX. 845.

[3] The Grover Cleveland Correspondence, Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress.

[4] A native of Georgia, who had been minister to both Colombia and Venezuela. In his book, *The Colombian and Venezuelan Republics* (Boston, 1918), p. 286, he says that he became legal adviser to Venezuela in 1893.

only of the arbitration treaty with full powers to effect the exchange of ratifications with Great Britain, but also of an unsealed letter from President Joaquin Crespo inviting Cleveland to serve as counsel for Venezuela. The letter was dated April 28, 1897, and was written in Spanish. Scruggs obligingly furnished an English translation for Cleveland. Crespo felt that:

> No one could better sustain the rights of Venezuela in this new rôle than the distinguished jurist and statesman to whom my country is already so much indebted for the many demonstrations of sympathy touching the history of this arbitration.[5]

Scruggs said he had consulted the Venezuelan government about counsel in addition to Cleveland and had suggested Senator John Tyler Morgan, Edward John Phelps, and ex-Senator George F. Edmunds to Crespo.[6] Cleveland, knowing of Andrade's work, was somewhat suspicious of Scruggs and deferred his answer until he had corresponded with Olney.

On May 17, 1897,[7] Cleveland wrote to Olney describing Scruggs's visit. He said that the suggestion of his heading the counsel was "ridiculous". At the same time, however, he feared that there was a danger of Venezuela's going into the arbitration with a "misfitting outfit". In relation to Olney's interest he wrote:

> Scruggs has been here with an unsealed letter to me from President Crespo of Venezuela offering to me and asking me to accept the position of counsel for his country in the Arbitration. Mr. Scruggs *approves* the suggestion and would *concede* me first place. Of course the thing is ridiculous, but I gravely told him that while at first sight my judgment was against it, I would consider the matter. I did this to get time to talk with you about the phases that cropped out during my talk with Crespo's envoy. . . .
>
> I am not sure that you would feel that you ought to bother at all with any further steps in the matter, but if you should desire to do anything that may be properly done to avoid a false step now, I thought you ought to know what I have here written.
>
> I hate to see a botch made of it now and I dont know as we can or ought to do anything. I dont know about Andrade as well as you do but except in clear cases I think they will all stand watching.[8]

Olney's reply of May 19, 1897, expressed his approval of Cleveland's refusal to serve as head counsel and at the same time revealed that the question of Storrow's successor had engaged a great deal of his own attention.[9] In his interview with Andrade he had learned that Storrow

[5] Joaquin Crespo to Grover Cleveland, Apr. 28, 1897, Cleveland Correspondence.

[6] Cleveland to Olney, May 17, 1897, Richard Olney Papers, Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] Olney to Cleveland, May 19, 1897, Cleveland Correspondence.

and Andrade had planned upon the selection of Joseph Hodges Choate for the argument of the case in Paris. Olney suggested Frederic R. Coudert as Storrow's successor. Andrade felt that the choice of Coudert would be admirable unless his having served on the boundary commission would be an objection.[10] On this point Olney consulted the American arbitrators, Chief Justice Melville W. Fuller and Judge David J. Brewer. Fuller wrote that he and Brewer thought Olney had better act as counsel. To this suggestion Olney replied that it was best for him to let well enough alone. Neither of the judges saw any objection to Coudert's acting in this capacity. Olney communicated their view to Andrade who replied on May 14, 1897, that he had referred Olney's recommendations to the Venezuelan government.

In New York Olney interviewed Coudert and found him "quite keen" to be employed, giving as his reason that it would be a pity if all the time he had given to the subject and the knowledge he had acquired should be wasted. Olney felt that Coudert was "just the man" to finish Storrow's brief and that Choate would be "first rate" for the presentation of the case in Paris. He suggested that Cleveland recommend their selection to Crespo.

On May 20, 1897, Cleveland replied to President Crespo's letter. He expressed his appreciation of the confidence shown in him and asked to be permitted to decline the offer. He then submitted Olney's recommendations in the following words:

> I trust my extreme desire that the Venezuelan cause may not lack the best possible presentation, will excuse the suggestion that I would not for a moment regard myself so well qualified for the important duty as such distinguished advocates among my countrymen as Mr. Choate, Mr. Coudert or Mr. Ex-Senator Edmunds.

On the same day Cleveland wrote to Olney inclosing Scruggs's translation of Crespo's invitation and a copy of his own reply to it. Cleveland was still suspicious of Scruggs and as a safeguard against misrepresentation he requested Olney to return the copy of his letter of refusal to Crespo.[11]

The Cleveland Correspondence contains no evidence as to why the men suggested were not employed. Since ex-President Harrison was later chosen one might suggest that the Venezuelan government, in its selection of counsel, desired first of all the prestige of an ex-President.

A. Bower Sageser.

The University of Nebraska.

[10] He was appointed in 1896 by President Cleveland as a member of the United States Commission for determining the boundary line.

[11] Cleveland to Olney, May 20, 1897, Cleveland Correspondence.

DOCUMENTS

A Chinese Official's Experiences during the First Opium War

LIANG CHANG-CHÜ, writer of the accompanying letter, is not, so far as I have found, mentioned in any account of the Opium War in a Western language. Except for the time in 1832 when Lindsay and Gutzlaff visited Shanghai in the *Lord Amherst,* he apparently never came into direct contact with the foreign barbarians. His good fortune in this respect was perhaps due to his discretion in asking for permission to retire, on account of ill health, from his office as governor of the province of Kiangsu just before the English, continuing their advance north in the spring of 1842, came into the province and, having taken Wusung and Shanghai, proceeded up the Yangtze River, captured Chinkiang, and then imposed their terms of peace on the Chinese at Nanking in August. Though thus unknown to Western chroniclers of the war he is not undeserving of attention. Nor is information about him lacking if we turn to Chinese sources.[1]

Born in 1775, Liang was almost 65 years old at the beginning of the Opium War. He had had a long and honorable career as an official in various parts of the empire, but especially in Kiangsu where he had spent many years in various offices—he had been four times governor of the province—and where he had gained an enviable reputation for his work in flood control and famine relief. When the Opium War began, however, he was governor of the province of Kuangsi. In 1838 he presented a report to the throne in favor of strict enforcement of the anti-opium laws, especially the severe punishment of those opening opium dens. Late in 1840 and early in 1841 he was sending troops and cannon to Kuangtung and was in close touch with the events there, and in

[1] There is a biographical article of considerable length about him in *Kuo-ch'ao ch'i-hsien lei-chêng* (*ch.* 202, ff. 1–5), and another in *Ch'ing-shih lieh-chuan* (*ch.* 38, ff. 29–32). *I nien lu hui pien* (*ch.* 13, f. 11) gives the dates of his birth and death—he was born in the 40th year of Ch'ien Lung (1775) and died in the 29th year of Tao Kuang (1849). A short biographical sketch, with a list of his most important literary works, is given in *Chung-kuo jén-ming ta tzŭ-tien* (p. 999). The *Ch'ou pan i wu shih mo* contains no fewer than thirty-seven different documents by or concerning him, of which twenty-one are edicts of the emperor and sixteen are reports to the throne by Liang or by him and other officials associated with him. There are also a number of literary works left by Liang, of which three, *Kuei t'ien so chi* (18 *ch.*), *Lang chi ts'ung t'an* (11 *ch.*), and *Lang chi hsü t'an* (8 *ch.*), are now in the Wason Collection.

August, 1841, having been commanded by the emperor to report on conditions in Kuangtung, he presented one report which bitterly blamed Ch'i Shan and Yü Pao-ch'un, prefect of Canton, for making the agreement of January, 1841, with Elliot and ceding Hongkong to the English, and for the general weakness of their administration of barbarian affairs; and another report which urged support of the loyal people of Canton and determined efforts to regain Hongkong. Liang had already, in April or May, 1841, been transferred to Kiangsu to be again governor of that province. During the rest of that year he was constantly occupied with preparations for the defense against the English, who started their expedition to the north in August. They had not, however, advanced farther north than Ningpo before Liang asked for and obtained permission to retire, in January or February, 1842. Whatever may have been his motives for that request one can readily understand that, old as he was and weary of public service as he may well have been, he did not feel equal to the new problems presented by the barbarian invasion. By the time he had reached P'uch'êng on his way to his home near Foochow he had heard about the peace made at Nanking and there he heard that Foochow itself was to be opened to the foreigners. His consternation over this is expressed in a letter he wrote to Liu Tz'ŭ-po, governor of Fukien, which he later published in a collection of memoirs, *Kuei t'ien so chi* (*ch.* 2, ff. 1–6). That letter I present here because it illustrates well the attitude toward the foreign invaders which prevailed among the whole official class of which Liang is representative until after the disastrous events of 1860.

Following the letter is a note in which Liang says that though Liu Tz'ŭ-po received his advice kindly he was not able to act upon it. He adds: "Just now I have heard that the English barbarians have at last come into the provincial capital and have exchanged calls with the great and small officials. Moreover they have occupied the Chi Ts'ui Ssŭ on the top of Wu Shih Shan. They have raised their flags, they beat their drums, and the people are much disturbed. The officials do not know what to do; now they repent the error of their first plan, and unfortunately my words have proved to be true. But of what use is repentance?"

Cornell University. GUSSIE ESTHER GASKILL.

The letter reads:

After I had obtained leave to retire, on account of illness, it was necessary that I return at once to Fukien. Since, however, just as I was making preparations for the journey I suddenly heard that in eastern Chekiang the English

were very violent, that the generals had retreated to Hangchow, that the district of Ch'ient'ang Chiang was under martial law and that unscrupulous people were taking advantage of the disorder to rob travelers, there seemed nothing to do but to stay temporarily at Yangchow. Then later, warning having been received at Yangchow that the barbarians' ships had already destroyed Chiaoshank'ou,[2] I hurriedly set out with my family. At the beginning of the sixth month when we crossed the River, soldiers were like trees and grass in Chingk'ou [Chinkiang]. In a boat that was like a leaf we escaped from the turmoil of war and pressed on. Just having passed Tanyang I heard that Chinkiang had already been taken by the barbarian soldiers and the way cut off.

Fortunately I happened to meet on the way, at the head of his soldiers, the general Ch'i Li-t'ang, councilor, coming from the north to join the defense forces. Formerly I was a colleague of the councilor's in Kansu. Availing ourselves of his protection we traveled rapidly day and night and succeeded in reaching Soochow in peace. Then again taking advantage night after night of the tide, we arrived at Fuyang, and our minds began to be at rest.

Arriving at Ch'üchou at the end of the sixth month we heard that the great officials of Kiangnan had used ten million taels of silver to make peace with the English, and had granted them permission to establish wharfs and carry on trade in the four provinces of Kiangnan, Chekiang, Fukien, and Kuangtung, and had already petitioned the Emperor that this be allowed. Alas! This is a covenant made inside the walls and there is no help for it; it is only a provisional scheme, but our Emperor's virtue is like that of heaven and, deeply grieving over the calamities which the people of the southeast have endured for so long, he is forced to do that which the officials have asked so that the people will have a respite in which to catch their breath. Of all the living creatures in the universe, there is not one which does not thank and praise the Emperor's charity, and does not sigh over the officials' incapability and failure.

Arriving at P'uch'êng at the beginning of the seventh month our intention was at once to take a boat and going with the current return home. Suddenly we heard that the English barbarians also desired to establish a wharf at Foochow and that the officials in charge of the negotiations had already petitioned the Throne that this be allowed. We heard, too, that the gentry of the provincial capital were all planning to move away; therefore we could not think of going ahead. Immediately we heard that this matter had already been the subject of an Imperial edict and that it had been absolutely disapproved. I could see that the Emperor's wisdom was very great, without selfishness, and that he could see beyond ten thousand *li*, so that the officials and people along the coast could all live peacefully (literally: till the fields and drill wells) as in the time of Yao and Shun. This was a cause of great rejoicing.

But before many days we heard that the officials in charge of the negotiations had again petitioned asking that the barbarians' desires be complied with. Truly I do not understand this. I wish to ask the officials—which are to be considered, the wishes of the barbarians or the wishes of our people? Previously in sanctioning the peace agreement our Emperor followed the desires of the people in granting the barbarians' requests. There are many

[2] Near Wusung, taken by the English on June 16, 1842. *Chinese Repository*, XI. 676.

instances in history of thus making exceptions to the rules. Now in petitioning to add another port the officials are opposing the people's wishes in order to grant the barbarians' wishes. What can be said in answer to this?

The people are the root of the nation. Have these officials considered the distinction between the roots and the twigs and the reasons for granting or opposing?

Moreover, the real meaning of this affair is easy to understand. Using the relative importance of provinces as a point of discussion, Fukien cannot take precedence over Kiangnan, Chekiang, and Kuangtung. Using wealth and power as a point of discussion Fukien cannot be considered superior to Kiangnan, Chekiang, and Kuangtung. But in each of the provinces of Kiangnan, Chekiang, and Kuangtung it is allowed to establish only one wharf, while in Fukien, one province alone, it is necessary to add another in order to please the barbarians. What can be said in answer to this?

Moreover, Kiangnan's Shanghai, Chekiang's Ningpo, Fukien's Amoy, Kuangtung's Macao are places to which barbarian boats came to trade in the past, while Foochow since the opening of the country [*i.e.,* its capture by the Manchus] has not at all had this sort of affair. Such a thing has never been heard of, and, in order respectfully to obey outer barbarians, to force our Fukien merchant people, several hundred of thousands of households, to be administered under one law with Shanghai, Ningpo, and Amoy does not yet accord either with the country's plan, the welfare of the people, or the constitution. To this also, what reply can be made?

Moreover, of all the provinces of the central plain and the seacoast, it is not a case of one being enough. If the said barbarians, citing the precedent of Fukien, in Shantung ask for a wharf at Tengchow, in Chihli ask for a wharf at Tientsin, in Liaotung ask for a wharf at Chinchow, will they have only to command to be obeyed? Moreover, of the outer barbarians it is not a case of one nation only. If all the outer barbarians cite the example of the English and also in each seacoast province ask separately to establish a wharf, then will they also have only to command to be obeyed?

Moreover, Foochow, the provincial capital, is distant from the open sea at Wuhu Men more than 110 *li*. Soochow, the provincial capital, is not more than 100 *li* distant from the port of Ch'angshou. The capital of Chekiang is also not more than 100 *li* distant from the gate to the sea at K'anche. Kuangchow [Canton], the provincial capital, is distant not more than several tens of *li* from Macao. If all use the excuse of being able to enter from the sea and all, citing the example of Foochow, ask to be allowed in each province separately to establish a wharf, then, what reply can be made to resist them?

Moreover, do the officials know the reason why the barbarians must go to Foochow? That which the barbarians must have is Chinese tea leaves and the product of Ch'ung An is that which they especially crave. Having obtained Foochow they can gradually advance to Ch'ung An. Here there was early a report that the barbarians had a desire to buy Wu I Shan. Certainly this was not without foundation. If they shall have already established a wharf at Foochow then in the region of Yen and Chien they will certainly come and go without anything to hinder them. I remember that at the end of spring and the beginning of summer of the year *i-wei* of Tao Kuang [Tao Kuang, 15th year—1835] the barbarians already had two large ships anchored at T'ai Chiang, and in a small boat they went from Hung-

shanch'iao directly up to Shui K'ou. At that time the lieutenant governor, Chêng Mêng-po, having asked for leave of absence and laid down his duties, was returning to his home. In the middle of Chuch'i Chiang he met them; he ordered every soldier of all the garrisons they passed to fire upon them with cannon and force them back.[3] At that time they already had the idea of going to Ch'ung An to survey the tea mountain. That for which their mouths water is Wu I and we know that now the barbarians' confidence in their own power compared with ten years ago is still greater. Having obtained Lung to hope for Shu [4] is man's usual disposition. How much more impossible to satisfy are dogs and sheep! If this scheme succeeds it will have evil results which cannot be foretold. I hope that the officials in charge of the negotiations together with the city's civil and military officials and with the local gentry will consider carefully and earnestly petition the Emperor; they will certainly obtain the Imperial edict and be in accord with the common people, and they will cause the English barbarians to know that China does not permit them to use unreasonable methods and recklessly trespass and that from now on they must respectfully obey commands. I do not want in after days to cite Lu Lung's guilt in blaming the great officials and scholars of the present time. I humbly dare to salute you, and bowing low hope that you will consider my words; then I shall be very fortunate.

[3] See Chinese Repository, XI. 655.

[4] Present Shensi and Szechuan. *Cf.* our English proverb "Give an inch, take an ell".

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS

Adventures of Ideas. By ALFRED NORTH WHITEHEAD, F.R.S., F.B.A., Fellow of Trinity College, University of Cambridge, and Professor of Philosophy in Harvard University. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1933. Pp. xii, 392. $3.50.)

Adventures of Ideas is divided into four parts: Sociological, Cosmological, Philosophical, Civilization. Since it might be classed as history, philosophy of history, history of philosophy, or sociology, some readers may be distressed by its lack of 'unity'. A book so loaded with penetrating insights and illuminating ideas would be well purchased at the price of any amount of unity; but this book does not in fact lack unity. Its unity is to be found, not in the subject matter, but in the central ideas entertained by the author. Together with Professor Whitehead's *Science and the Modern World* and *Process and Reality,* the present book is "an endeavour to express a way of understanding the nature of things, and to point out how that way of understanding is illustrated by a survey of the mutations of human experience". This way (*a* way, not *the* way) of understanding is often stated; but I will take that formulation of it that is likely to be of most interest to historians.

> The creation of the world—said Plato—is the victory of persuasion over force. The worth of men consists in their liability to persuasion. They can persuade and can be persuaded by the disclosure of alternatives, the better and the worse. Civilization is the maintenance of social order, by its own inherent persuasiveness as embodying the nobler alternative. The recourse to force, however unavoidable, is a disclosure of the failure of civilization, either in the general society or in a remnant of individuals. . . . Civilised order survives on its merits, and is transformed by its power to recognize its imperfections (p. 105).

Otherwise stated, Professor Whitehead's object is to demolish the concept of "a Divine Despot and a Slavish Universe" (p. 32). This object provides the book with all the unity required.

The concept of a Slavish Universe cannot be demolished unless one can find some weak joint in the armor of 'scientific determinism'. Many earnest Christian moralists and some scientists think that the famous 'quantum theory' is this weak joint. Professor Whitehead is not so naïve. He knows that nothing less than a new metaphysics can furnish a rational basis for believing that the mind of man is free and responsible; and in Part III. he suggests the point of departure for finding an indeterminite free-play, a certain amount of liberty or creativity of mind, within the conditioned process of

nature. Starting with the recent scientific notion that the essential reality is not 'substance' but 'event', he reëxamines the concepts 'subjects and objects', 'past, present, future' in terms of what he calls the 'occasion of experience'. He finds that within each 'occasion of experience' the psyche (mind, soul, consciousness, call it what you will) is not a mere dead link in the chain of past, present, future, but an active, transforming agency; so that the "occasion [of experience] *arises as an effect facing its past and ends as a cause facing its future. In between there lies the teleology of the universe*" (p. 249). Obviously Professor Whitehead's attack on the concept of 'a Slavish Universe' stands or falls with the validity of his metaphysical doctrine. No brief summary can do justice to his argument, and in any case a historian is no judge of it. I will say merely that for the first time in twenty years I have come across something novel and worth thinking about in a discussion of the age-long question of Freedom *vs.* Determinism.

Valid or invalid, Professor Whitehead's metaphysics is the foundation for all else in his book. His metaphysics should be of use to historians; but I am afraid many of them will say that it has nothing to do with history. Passing lightly over this curious abberation, I can at least commend to them the introduction, and the first part, 'Sociological'. Here is much food for thought for all historians, especially for those who still fancy it possible to "establish the facts and let them speak for themselves". For example, "the notion of . . . history devoid of aesthetic prejudice, devoid of all reliance on . . . cosmological generalizations, is a figment of the imagination. The belief in it can only occur to minds steeped in . . . the provincialism of an epoch . . . of a school of learning—minds unable to divine their own unspoken limitations" (p. 4). If, upon reading this, the historian still hopes to keep afloat by taking firmer hold on that so useful piece of driftwood, 'scientific method', he should go on to 'Cosmological'; there he will find that the very 'objective science' which he relies on, like the 'objective history' which he cherishes, is ultimately sustained by nothing firmer than its own subjective buoyancy. "No science can be more secure than the metaphysics which tacitly it presupposes." "Observational discrimination is not dictated by impartial facts. It selects and discards, and what it retains is arranged in a subjective order of prominence. This order of prominence in observation is in fact a distortion of the facts" (pp. 197–198). Nature, like history, is "patient of interpretations in terms of Laws that happen to interest us" (p. 174). Not that either history or science is the less valuable for that; but the great point is that "systems, scientific and philosophic, come and go. Each method of limited understanding is at length exhausted. In its prime each system is a triumphant success; in its decay it is an obstructive nuisance" (p. 203). Any historian can find ample illustration of this generalization in the history of history; but he may console himself with the fact that the history of science illustrates it equally well. The great

example of course is the Newtonian physics, which for three centuries "transformed thought, and . . . the physical activities of mankind", which until recently was thought to be the "fundamental notion" beyond which there "lay mere aimless speculation", but which has at last "completely collapsed . . . as a fundamental notion for physical science. In the modern science, it is a limited notion confined to special purposes" (p. 186).

And so, having followed the adventure of ideas for two thousand years, Professor Whitehead concludes that mankind can do no more than "produce a variety of partial systems of limited generality". This conclusion might be reached, and has been reached, without recourse to metaphysics. But such a conclusion, without metaphysical foundation, is likely to issue in a skeptical disillusionment, the conviction that all thought is no more than a pragmatic instrument employed by the animal man in his effort to find warm corners in a cold universe; and for Professor Whitehead this is the 'Slavish Universe' in its most intolerable guise. Hence the recourse to metaphysics, in which he seeks some basis for believing that enduring values issue from the endless "perishing of occasions". I suggest that *Adventures of Ideas* will be, if not forever then for a very long time, one of the enduring values that survive the perishing occasions of our generation. I cannot imagine any person with an interest in general ideas (historian, scientist, philosopher, sociologist, literary critic) reading this book, omitting the metaphysics if he likes, without immense intellectual stimulation and refreshment.

Cornell University. CARL BECKER.

Geschichte der Schweiz. Von HANS NABHOLZ, LEONHARD VON MURALT, RICHARD FELLER, EMIL DÜRR. Band I., *Von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Ausgang des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts.* (Zurich: Schulthess and Company. 1932. Pp. xi, 525. 35 fr.)

AN attempt to cover the history of seventeen centuries in five hundred pages is liable to encounter difficulties when a country like Switzerland, a collection of separate political units, only reached a semblance of solidity at the close of that period, and two centuries and a half more had to elapse before these atoms attained the unity which we know to-day. In such a case the history might easily become a compilation of disconnected stories of thirteen commonwealths whose boundaries happened to adjoin. The alternative is to depict the process by which these regions developed their various political characteristics and show how far they acted in common in the midst of surrounding European powers, even though wars with one another occasionally occurred, until they became a federated state. From the latter point of view the authors of this volume have succeeded well. Hans Nabholz, archivist and historian, Leonhard von Muralt, specialist in the history of the Reformation, both approach their subjects with scholarly qualifications applied to a

work announced by the publishers to be intended for the general reader. To avoid any distraction from the narrative footnotes are entirely omitted, but at the beginning of each chapter a page of bibliography gives the sources and later writings which may be consulted with profit by the special student. The index covers only persons and places but an extensive analytical table of contents furnishes a key to the subjects. Clear print in Roman type makes an attractive page.

This well-ordered account reminds us once more that the history of Switzerland provides an example in miniature of the transformations which occurred everywhere in Europe. In the Middle Ages the people were in complete subjection to feudal lords with a few small cities in the midst of the agricultural picture. A revolt against excessive economic demands rather than a fight for theoretical liberty was the cause of the first league of three cantons in 1291, an example which led to other combinations till all were included. As elsewhere the gradual change in settlements of rents from payments in products to payments in money brought slow ruin to the noble landowners, but resulted in better conditions for the tenants and the cities. The latter with ready cash were able to buy more local privileges and to purchase territories outside their walls. This expansion of Swiss cities into territorial overlords is a vital factor in the story, for it explains their eventual political superiority and contains the germs of continuous jealousy and resistance on the part of the agricultural states. The rise of the industrial class into political power in the cities has its parallels in other countries, but here no royal government interfered with local autonomy. Internal wars have to be included in the tale, for unity was very slow in arriving and the country had only the semblance of a nation at the close of this volume. Finally all these things took place in a little country which varies from fertile rolling plains to almost inaccessible mountain pastures, thinly inhabited by a sturdy population which fitted the scenery. For a clear and understandable account of this complicated development Mr. Nabholz is to be commended.

Leonhard von Muralt's account of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation covers but a single century and owing to the striking conflicts in opinions and events the period permits a more dramatic treatment. An introduction to the political and economic conditions at the opening of the sixteenth century leads to a narrative of the reform movements in various parts of Switzerland, which is carried out with vividness but with restraint in the description of religious controversies.

J. M. V.

Histoire de Russie. Par PAUL MILIOUKOV, ancien professeur à l'Université de Moscou, CH. SEIGNOBOS, et L. EISENMANN, professeurs à l'Université de Paris. Trois tomes. (Paris: Ernest Leroux. 1932; 1933. Pp. xix, 1–435; vi, 439–827; vi, 829–1415. 60 fr.; 60 fr.; 80 fr.)

In the April issue of the *American Historical Review* I had occasion to discuss the late Professor Pokrovsky's *History of Russia.* Whereas that book presents a communistic interpretation of the subject, Professor Miliukov and his collaborators expound the facts of Russian history from the liberal point of view. The first volume of this work covers the period from the origins to the death of Peter the Great. In the second volume the progress of events up to the death of Nicholas I. is discussed. The third volume continues the narrative to the present. In the preparation of this work Professor Miliukov has enjoyed the collaboration of several scholars as highly qualified as himself, and the result is both authoritative and instructive. Several chapters have been written by such Russian historians as Professor Kizevetter, who recently died in Prague, and Professor Miakotin, now of Sofia. The geographical background is presented by Professor Camena d'Almeida of Bordeaux, and the noted Czech scholar, Professor Niederle, has written an archæological introduction. The Russian manuscript was revised by the French co-editors, Professors Eisenmann and Seignobos. Professor Seignobos wrote the preface.

The reader becomes well aware of both the advantages and disadvantages of this complex work of co-editorship and collaboration. Coördination is sometimes lacking between various chapters of the book. On page 75 of volume I., for example, we are informed that the expansion of the Slavs over the area of European Russia started in the fifth century. Further on (p. 81) it is stated that this expansion began in the seventh century. Special sections of volume I. have been devoted to the question of the intellectual and artistic development of Russia in the seventeenth century. In volume II., dealing with the events of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries, there are a few sections bearing on the intellectual but none on the artistic development of Russia. The same is true in regard to volume III., and it is only in the last chapter dealing with Soviet Russia that arts and music again make their appearance. Those parts of the work dealing with the early, so-called Kievan period of Russian history, as well as those dealing with the Ukraine are sketchy and out of proportion to other parts of the book. Apparently, insufficient space has been assigned to these sections by the editors.

On the other hand there is unity throughout with regard to the point of view from which the material has been prepared and assembled. More attention has been paid to the influence of the West on Russian civilization than to its original creative forces. As to the question of the influence of the East on Russia, the authors do not conceal their antipathy to the "Eurasian" school of Russian historical thought. In my opinion, such a rigid "Westernizing" tendency must be considered as a defect. As a result of it, certain fundamental factors which influenced the development of Russian history have been underemphasized. The geographical introduction for example, confines itself to the area known as "European" Russia. To cite another example, the

relations between medieval Russia and the nomadic peoples of the East have not been duly expounded. Consequently the historical background of the later Russian expansion in Asia is not clear. Because this point of view is so rigid, Professor Seignobos in his preface (p. xvi) could express the opinion that everything in the history of Russian civilization is but the reflection of the West. It is doubtful if the Russian scholars who collaborated in this work fully share that opinion.

While this work does not contain a detailed bibliography, there is a valuable introductory chapter by Miliukov on the sources for Russian history and the development of Russian historiography up to the Revolution. It seems strange, however, that no reference has been made to the important documents which have been published, or to the condition of historical science in Russia since the Revolution.

Yale University. GEORGE VERNADSKY.

Russia: a Social History. By D. S. MIRSKY. Edited by Professor C. G. Seligman, F.R.S. (New York: Century Company. 1932. Pp. xix, 312, xxi. $6.00.)

HERE is a generally successful attempt to do a very difficult thing: that is, to present in one short volume a sketch of Russian history from the beginning of things down to the Revolution of 1917. The author not only surveys this history—he illuminates it. The story runs wide and deep; its subject is the whole life of man, from the economic plowing and sowing to the gathering of the cultural harvest, and the book is at its best—where most other general sketches of Russian history are weakest—in the treatment, first, of the subordinate racial groups, and second, of such cultural subjects as architecture, painting, literature, and religion.

The volume has one conspicuous virtue that is also, in a fashion, the cause of its chief weakness. That is, it contains a smaller proportion of specific factual detail, and a larger proportion of generalization and interpretation, than any other sketch of Russian history with which the reviewer is acquainted. This concentration upon major problems is wholly desirable in such a sketch—or so it seems to the reviewer; but the method calls for a broader knowledge of the facts than the purest factualist is likely to possess, and it requires at the same time not only a powerful imagination to project hypotheses, but also a candid and merciless critical judgment that will confirm these same hypotheses, or break them down and discard them once for all. These are the marks of a high calling, and it is not surprising that the author of this book does not everywhere exhibit them in full perfection.

Prince Mirsky is justified, certainly, in emphasizing the importance of the non-Slavic elements in Kievan civilization, but he would find it difficult to demonstrate that this civilization had "no roots in pre-Russian Slavdom"

(p. 34). The statement that "the essentially individualistic character of Russian society [in the Tatar period] was not diminished by the existence of the territorial corporation (*volost*)", with its common holding of a part of the land, is clearly self-contradictory (p. 106); and this statement is symptomatic of the author's tendency to minimize or neglect entirely those collectivist phases of peasant economy that existed before the establishment of the practice of making a periodical repartition of the cultivated land (pp. 102, 106). The contrast between the conditions existing before and after the establishment of this practice is therefore somewhat overemphasized, and the whole problem of the origin of the repartitional commune—one of the most obscure and controversial questions in the entire range of Russian history—is rather too summarily disposed of (p. 149). Again, the author makes too much of the resemblances between Russian serfdom and American slavery, and gives rather too little weight to the peculiarity that most clearly distinguished the one from the other—the fact that the typical Russian serf was not a landless laborer, but a small farmer who held an allotted portion of his master's estate and devoted at least a part of his time to its cultivation (pp. 195, 205–206). This condition colored much of the life and thought of the Russian peasantry, and has not ceased to do so down to the present moment.

The decline of the old natural economy and the development of commercial capitalism was a long, slow process—a transition much less abrupt than the author represents it to have been (pp. 124, 144). The handicraft industries, always important in the economy of Russia, are sadly neglected; and why, when the author gives so much thought to economic history, does he fail to make the point that when Russia plunged into the great Revolution of 1917, a large part of her agriculture and an important share of her industry were still anything but "capitalistic"?

The final and complete subordination of the Church to the monarchy is connected by the author with the penetration of European ideas into Russia—"the substitution of Western for Byzantine political thinking" (pp. 177–178, 183–184). It is true that Peter the Great had before him the example of contemporary Western monarchs who had religious affairs very well under their control; yet it is also true that in the general course of history the Western Church had been both more vigorous and more successful than the Eastern in the assertion of claims to power. If Czar Peter found it comparatively easy to "behead the Russian Church", this was due in some part to the very fact that the Russians and their Church had been nurtured in the tradition of "Byzantine political thinking". Again, one may very well say that in the eighteenth century the monarchy was in some degree "secularized" (p. 141), but the time never came when this monarchy ceased to claim, or the Church to grant to it, the sanction of religion.

In the field of cultural interests, one is disposed to question the author's

social interpretation of realism and symbolism in Russian literature (pp. 271, 273–274), and to argue, too, that the history of education hardly receives the attention that it deserves. The ten illustrations included in the volume are rather too narrowly selected, since they are drawn, with one exception, from the field of religious art, but they do good service in illuminating the history of architecture and of painting, while the seventeen sketch-maps are a very real convenience to the reader.

Other questions, major and minor, might be brought forward; but considering the breadth and boldness of the book, it is remarkable how little one finds in it to object to. The author wrote under the drive of a vital interest—there is no mistaking that; and this interest draws after it the interest of the reader. In no other general sketch of Russian history has the reviewer found so much stimulation, nor can he name another author who has succeeded in packing into a single brief volume so much of the rich essence of the history of this people.

Columbia University. GEROID TANQUARY ROBINSON.

BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

The Cambridge Ancient History. Edited by S. A. COOK, Litt.D., F. E. ADCOCK, M.A., M. P. CHARLESWORTH, M.A. Volume IX., *The Roman Republic, 133–44 B. C.* (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. xxxi, 1022, 3 tables. $9.00.)

THE ninth volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History* deals mainly with the fortunes of Rome from the tribunate of Tiberius Gracchus to the death of Julius Caesar. The events of these years are discussed, possibly in greater detail than has been customary in this series, by writers most of whom have contributed to earlier volumes, Hugh Last, R. Gardner, H. A. Ormerod, M. Cary, C. Highnett, and F. E. Adcock. Chapters on special subjects deviating from the main stream of Roman history are inserted at appropriate places. Thus the career of Pompey is interrupted by E. R. Bevan's chapter on the Jews and G. H. Stevenson's discussion of provincial government. W. W. Tarn's account of Parthian history makes a real contribution to our knowledge of Rome's new enemy in the East. At the end of the volume are placed a survey of Roman literature in the age of Cicero by E. E. Sikes, a discussion of Ciceronian society by J. Wright Duff, an appreciative study of Roman art in the time of the Republic by Mrs. Strong, and an important summary of the development of Roman law by F. de Zulueta.

This volume of more than a thousand pages is larger than any of its predecessors. The editors are apparently now faced with a serious dilemma. Either they must ruthlessly emasculate the remaining volumes, or they must expect progressively to frighten away prospective readers by the forbidding

ponderosity which will result from a continuance of their present policy. Of the two alternatives, probably the second is preferable. Would it not be possible, however, to cut the knot by issuing the remainder of the set in half volumes?

In a period as familiar as the last century of the Roman Republic, readers cannot expect to find startling novelties of treatment, nor will they find them here. Instead, the volume is marked by sobriety of judgment, the product of long familiarity on the part of the various authors with the problems of the age and thoughtful consideration of the evidence. One may not agree with this or that author's point of view, and his interpretation of men and facts may be at variance with that held by the reader. Still the competence and honesty of the authors and their independence of thought cannot be questioned.

In place of criticizing, I shall select a few typical passages by which the readers of the *Review* can estimate the work of three important contributors to the volume. About Tiberius Gracchus, for example, Mr. Last says that he was "steering Rome straight for ochlocracy; and, though such an issue was probably far from his own intention, there was truth in the oligarchic allegation that, in the fashion familiar among the Greeks, this champion of the people was threatening to establish a tyranny. The tyrant, it is true, would be controlled by his supporters; but he would be none the less a tyrant for the fact that he was bound to fall if ever he forfeited the friendship of the *plebs urbana*." He says also "Tiberius Gracchus was a young man whose enthusiasm carried him away. His intentions were of the best, though anxiety for the cause of social reform led him to constitutional innovations which were ill-considered and impracticable." On the other hand, "the manner of his death stood as an indelible condemnation of the system which his opponents were claiming to uphold". "The oligarchy betrayed its latent weakness by recourse to bloodshed in a difficulty so slight that the sanctions of any stable constitution should have mastered it with ease."

Professor Cary writes of Cicero after his consulship that his panacea, the Concord of All Good Men, "was a woefully inadequate remedy for the ills of the later Republic. It gave no thought to numerous reforms which were dangerously overdue." Professor Cary had in mind particularly the infusion of new blood into the senate, the maintenance of order in Rome against rioters and assassins, and the protection of the provinces against the parasitism of senators, equites, and urban proletariat. "But Cicero's lack of clear vision into the future was shared by all his chief contemporaries, with the sole exception of Caesar."

Professor Adcock's characterization of Pompey is worth quoting. "Set to a task within the ambit of his powers, he was clear-headed, swift, and single-minded. Once the task was done virtue went out of him. His nature forbade him to grasp openly at power and rendered him maladroit at seizing it."

The difference between Pompey and Caesar lay "not in technical skill or judgement or resource, but in that Pompey lacked that fusing together of spirit and intellect that marks off genius from talent".

I quote also from Professor Adcock's estimate of Caesar's genius. It was, he says, "the hard practical genius of Rome raised to the highest power; he was a keen edge on an old blade. But he reached power late, too late for patience." "For this reason he could not admit Time to his counsels, nor share them with others. Thus he became, in a sense, un-Roman in the last year of his life. There came the clash between his genius and the Roman steady tradition, and in the clash he was broken, with plans unachieved and plans unmade. He had shown the world the greatest of the Romans, but he was not the creator of a new epoch. Whatever he might have done, he had as yet neither destroyed the Republic nor made the principate. His life had set an example of autocracy which his death converted into a warning." "Caesar had done much for the State in his reforms, but he did Rome no greater service than by his death."

The University of Cincinnati. ALLEN B. WEST.

Caravan Cities: Petra, Jerash, Palmyra, Dura. By M. ROSTOVTZEFF. Translated by D. and T. TALBOT RICE. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1932. Pp. xiv, 232. $4.50.)

FIVE years ago Professor Rostovtzeff published in Russian at Berlin and Paris a group of travel sketches based on a trip through Syria, Palestine, and Arabia early in 1928. Revision and rewriting of those essays on the basis of more recent and more ambitious travel in the East has produced the present volume. The author is frank to state that this is not "a final and complete picture either of caravan trade in general or of the life of certain caravan cities in particular", but he is confident that it does indicate the "line of research" which the coming archæological investigation in Syria, Palestine, and Arabia should follow, that is, the recognition that the caravan city is a peculiar and distinctive type.

An introductory chapter sketches the history of the caravan trade from the earliest civilizations in the Nile and Tigris-Euphrates valleys to the end of the Roman period: the routes, the objects of trade, with their origins and destinations, and their influence upon the countries which imported them, the contributions to the progress of the caravan trade made by the great empires which successively controlled its destinies.

The other five chapters describe the history, the excavation, and the monuments of the four caravan cities of the book's subtitle, Palmyra and Dura sharing a joint chapter, as well as having each its own. The present aspect of the sites is charmingly described, and the life and circumstances of the ancient inhabitants vividly recreated from the archæological remains.

Of many interesting conclusions one example must suffice here. The so-called temple of Isis at Petra, Rostovtzeff believes belonged to Tyche, "the Hellenistic equivalent of the Iranian Hvareno and the Semitic Gad, and who at the same time was the mighty deity of the Petraean Arabs, the moon-goddess Allat". And he dates the temple, on the basis of its style and the relationship of its ornamentation to the second Pompeian style, from the late Hellenistic period, instead of the second or third century A. D.

The book is richly illustrated by thirty-five plates, six drawings in the text, and five maps and plans. Most of the plates carry two illustrations, and several a larger number. The pictures are therefore small; but they are sharply clear, and we should rather be grateful for the number than complain of the size, in these days. Almost half the plates are supplied with the illuminating descriptions which Professor Rostovtzeff does so surpassingly well. They do not, however, this time face the plates but follow the chapters to which the respective plates belong.

There is a seven-page bibliography, classified according to the chapters of the text and, further, by topics. The six-page index consists almost exclusively of proper names.

The translation of D. and T. Talbot Rice is good; but "exterior" (p. 86) should surely be "external", "at least" (p. 173) should, I suspect, be "no less than", and there is one very clumsy sentence (p. 200) about Caracalla and Geta.

Western Reserve University. ROBERT SAMUEL ROGERS.

Le génie grec dans la religion. Par LOUIS GERNET, professeur à l'Université d'Alger, et ANDRÉ BOULANGER, professeur à l'Université de Strasbourg. [Bibliothèque de synthèse historique.] (Paris: Renaissance du Livre. 1932. Pp. xlii, 538. 40 fr.)

THIS long and learned work is divided into three parts, entitled severally La formation du système de l'époque classique, Le système de l'époque classique, and Vers l'universalisme. Obviously the general arrangement is chronological, and the book will be classed by bibliographers as a history of Greek religion. But the authors have not undertaken to present a consecutive story of the development of religion in Greece. Their purpose has been to set forth and interpret the facts of religion in their relation to the forms of the social order. To this end they have assembled the results of their own researches and of the researches of the many scholars who have been active in this field in the last decades, and organized them afresh in a manner which is highly illuminating and instructive.

Of the first two parts, which are the work of Professor Gernet, it is the first in which his originality is principally displayed. He has not tried to produce an account of the origin of Greek religion on the basis of the scanty

and insufficient evidence which is available for the obscure ages which preceded classical times. The Minoan-Mycenæan period is dismissed in a few judicious pages. No special section is assigned to a study of religion in the Homeric poems. Nothing is to be found of the ethnological reconstructions of the German school, nothing of the anthropological analogies which English scholars like to bring forward, nothing of the speculations of Durkheim and his associates concerning the nature of primitive mentality. What we find is an attempt to explain the manifold forms of the perfected system and the countless survivals from earlier conditions as proceeding from the normal functions of the various grades and stages of society. Briefly, these stages, or rather grades (since the chronological order cannot be insisted upon throughout), are taken to be: First, peasant life with its characteristic response to the facts of nature and human existence; second, the royal and aristocratic order, from which the heroic legend sprang; third, the social agitation which came with the proselytizing religion of Dionysus; and, fourth, the organization of the city-state and the rudimentary steps toward national union.

The second part, also by Professor Gernet, follows a more conventional plan. The forms of cult, religious ideas and conceptions ("représentations"), the religious life of the various social groups, are discussed in turn; and the section closes with an admirable essay on Greek piety.

The third part of the book, which has been written by Professor Boulanger, is a discussion of religion in the Hellenistic world. It makes the happy distinction between the old forms which continue in a new guise, and the new forms which were introduced in this period, the ruler cult and the Oriental religions; and it closes with a discussion of the Hellenistic philosophies. But, save for certain particular matters, there is less originality in this part of the book than in the earlier parts.

In general it may be said that the work is not planned as a reference book to which one may go for the objective facts of Greek religion. The authors operate freely with these facts and assume a fair knowledge of them on the part of the reader. It has been their choice to subject these facts to speculative scrutiny and to integrate them in a shrewdly conceived synthesis which shall leave (and which does leave) with the reader a fair notion of the nature of religion in the Greek world and its part in the social order.

The University of California. IVAN M. LINFORTH.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL HISTORY

The Collected Papers of Thomas Frederick Tout with a Memoir and Bibliography. Volume I., *Miscellaneous Papers, chiefly on the Study of History and the University of Manchester.* [Publications of the University of Manchester, Historical Series, no. LXIII.] (Manchester: University Press. 1932. Pp. 213. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

THE volume contains a number of papers roughly classified under five headings. It opens with F. M. Powicke's British Academy Memoir and descriptions of Tout's activities as a citizen and as a member of the University of Manchester; both of the latter are new. There follow two series of papers by Tout himself, the first dealing in the main with the work of the Manchester school of history and the second with "history and historians". The fourth section contains his reviews of three books and the fifth a select bibliography of his publications. Several of the papers were first printed in periodicals that are not generally accessible; their publication in this form is very welcome. One paper, History at Owens College (pp. 61–76), has not hitherto appeared in print.

The collection of papers is chiefly of value as revealing the ideals and the methods of an eminent teacher of history. In this connection the biographical sketches in the third section are almost as pertinent as the more obviously relevant papers in section two. In the sketch of Freeman's work, written in 1892, we find: "The present age is the age of the microscope, and we are more likely to find men who will grub up unpublished charters than men who will hold that broad and masterful grasp of all periods of history which was preeminently his gift" (p. 132). There follows this statement, "It may well be that a generation hence an age wearied of minute specialists will turn back to Freeman's wealth of historical nature with admiration and envy." That the generation to which he referred did not do what he tentatively prophesied was as much due to him as to anyone else in England. He is revealed in these papers as primarily interested in stimulating research within limited fields. In 1910 he wrote, "A quarter of a century ago the only known way of teaching and learning history in England was by attending lectures, reading books, and taking to one's teacher essays, which were primarily regarded as exercises in style" (p. 81). To offset this Tout and his colleagues at Manchester developed a school of history in which, for the first time in England, there was offered adequate training for research. Section II. is largely devoted to the aims and methods of this school. Paleography and the other auxiliary sciences, restricted fields of study, seminar methods, and theses based upon the examination of original sources, are emphasized throughout. The result of this training was a group of graduates of which any university might well be proud.

Tout was, of course, a medievalist and the school which he directed laid its main emphasis upon the medieval field; but his methods and ideals are equally applicable to Ancient or Modern history. Anyone interested in the development of the study and writing of history in England will find much in this volume that will repay careful examination.

The University of Colorado. JAMES F. WILLARD.

Borough and Town: a Study of Urban Origins in England. By CARL STEPHENSON, Professor of History, Cornell University. [Monographs

of the Mediaeval Academy of America, no. 7.] (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1933. Pp. xvi, 236 $4.75.)

THIS study is a brilliant exposition of a new theory with regard to the origin of English towns. The new point of view is achieved by an examination of the English sources in the light of what has been established about urban beginnings on the Continent. This essential background is placed before the reader in the first two chapters. A brief critical analysis of the theories which have been presented by Continental scholars leads to the conclusion that Pirenne's mercantile settlement theory accords best with the evidence. The survey concludes with illustrations of the growth of urban communities on the Continent and of the privileges which they received. It serves not only as an introduction to the main theme of the book but also as a convenient guide to the literature of urban origins in northwestern Europe.

In his treatment of Anglo-Saxon boroughs the present writer has much in common with Maitland, who, though inspired by Keutgen, anticipated some aspects of the mercantile settlement theory. Stephenson, however, rejects the "tenurial heterogeneity" theory, departs from Maitland on other points, and goes beyond him in fullness of presentation and analysis of the evidence. His approach, moreover, is social rather than legal. English boroughs of the tenth century, he maintains, were fortified enclosures and the centers of administrative districts. Many of them had courts which were coördinated with the courts of the shire or the hundred. Such a court belonged to the administrative district of which the borough was the center and not to the borough itself. It was territorial and not urban. He finds no connection between the court of the Anglo-Saxon borough and the later constitution of the privileged town. Thus goes overboard a theory which has received some measure of support from Gross, Maitland, and other scholars. To Miss Bateson's conclusion that the old in the borough custom of a later day outweighed the new, Stephenson replies in essence that it may be true of the forms but not of the substance. Some of the boroughs of the tenth century also had mints and markets. Their trade, however, was local. The population of the boroughs was rural and not urban.

The revival of commerce which brought to some of the boroughs a population of traders destined in time to make them urban communities took place in the eleventh century. Maitland was inclined to place this conversion of boroughs to towns in the century preceding the Norman Conquest. He saw in the borough of Domesday a community which was not agrarian (*Domesday Book and Beyond*, pp. 196–198). Stephenson thinks the revolution took place in the second half of the eleventh century. Though there are indications of increasing maritime trade earlier in the century, his analysis of the evidence leaves little doubt that the inhabitants of most of the boroughs mentioned in Domesday did not make their living by commerce. Communal privileges had already been acquired by a few of the old boroughs, such as York and

Dover, but only in the new boroughs containing a population of French merchants were they common. Burgage tenure, which was a communal privilege of fundamental importance in the later free boroughs, was, as Miss Bateson suggested, a French importation, and not, as Hemmeon thought, of Anglo-Saxon origin. The liberties granted to the new boroughs in charters issued early in the twelfth century were of the same type as those given to French towns, and the liberties of the old boroughs, though some of them were prescriptive, were similar. "In the time of Henry I. the borough was a community of men living principally through commerce and enjoying privileged status by virtue of the special law which there obtained. Whatever it had previously been, the borough henceforth appears as a town" (p. 137).

The development of these towns is carried down to the close of the twelfth century, with discussion of such problems as *firma burgi,* burghal aids and tallages, the relation of the guilds to the boroughs, and the influence of the commune in the development of self-government in English towns. On some topics, such as borough taxation, much new evidence is presented, and on others new points of view.

The last chapter contains a topographical description of the growth of a number of boroughs, illustrated by maps. The application of archæological evidence to the problem, which is new in relation to English boroughs, supplements the historical evidence strongly. In many instances the addition to an old borough of a new quarter occupied by traders can be traced in the extant remains of a town.

In attempting to state briefly what this volume adds to our knowledge it has been necessary to omit mention of much of the destructive criticism with which its pages abound. Opinions and conclusions advanced by earlier writers on the subject fall like ninepins before the attack of Stephenson's incisive logic. But the author tears down what his predecessors have built only that he may rear a more soundly reasoned structure on the foundation of the evidence. This is his great contribution to the subject. Though distinguished historians have interpreted the sources concerning the origin of English towns, none has previously evolved a comprehensive theory which was entirely satisfactory. Nearly every historian who has produced such a theory has acknowledged that there were or might be significant exceptions to it. Students who have tried to test any extant theory have been troubled by pieces of evidence which would not fit. In the present synthesis all of the existing evidence seems to fall into place. Though all of the details may not continue to hold the exact position which the author has assigned to them and some of the evidence may admit differences of interpretation, it does not seem probable that the main outlines will be changed vitally by any subsequent evaluation of the known evidence.

Haverford College. W. E. Lunt.

The English Church and the Papacy, from the Conquest to the Reign of John. By Z. N. Brooke, M.A., Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1931. Pp. xii, 260. $3.25.)

The title under which Professor Brooke publishes his Birkbeck Lectures of 1929–1931 is somewhat misleading, for he is primarily concerned here with the bearing of the canon law of the period upon the relations between the English Church and Rome. Within this narrower field it is an admirably clear and effective survey. There are three parts, an introduction, the purpose of which "is to elucidate the meaning of the phrase 'the English Church' . . . in the period"; Part I., the Law of the Church in England; Part II., the Relations of England with the Papacy. The author accepts Hubert Walter's definition of the English Church—"that portion of the Church which the Most High has planted in England", and argues that to follow the relations of this portion of the Church with the papacy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, it is first necessary to determine what was the existing law of the English Church. In Part I., through a difficult manuscript study the author traces the development of canon law in England, "almost with precision as far as the second half of the eleventh century is concerned; in less distinct outline, though with more material, in the first half of the twelfth century; and perfectly clearly again in the second half of the twelfth century and onwards". All the collections of canon law, as they came into general use on the Continent, appeared in England as well, and neither in the range of its canonical literature, nor in the activity of its councils, did the English Church approach a separate body of church law. The English Church recognized the same law as the rest of the Church—it possessed and used the same collections of church law that were employed in the rest of the Church; there is no evidence that the English Church in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was governed by laws selected by itself. Part II. rapidly sketches the relations between England and the papacy from Lanfranc through Thomas Becket, with an epilogue to Magna Carta. Lanfranc agreed with William the Conquerer in opposing the novel idea of a centralized Church directly controlled in all its parts by the pope, and archbishop and king were supported by unanimous ecclesiastical opinion in England. With St. Anselm there arose a papal party in England, and Henry I. maintained royal control only with difficulty. When Stephen guaranteed freedom to the Church, that is, freedom to obey the laws of the Church, especially the new reforming decrees, the English Church drew perceptibly nearer to Rome. After the unfortunate death of Thomas Becket, Henry II. was unable to regain the ground lost by his predecessor; how completely canon law had won the victory is shown by the fact that among the four hundred decretals of Alexander III. in the *Decretales* of Gregory IX., there are more addressed to the English Church than to all the rest of Europe. And in Magna Carta the king's first promise

is to allow freedom of election to the English Church. The appendix furnishes a valuable list of English manuscripts containing collections of ecclesiastical law and the index is adequate. It is in Part I. that the most significant contribution has been made to the literature of the subject, though the book as a whole has the great (and rare) merit of giving the English Church its proper place in medieval Christendom.

The University of California. PAUL SCHAEFFER.

L'essor de l'Europe, XI^e^–XIII^e^ siècles. Par LOUIS HALPHEN, professeur honoraire à l'Université de Bordeaux, directeur à L'École des Hautes Études historiques et philologiques (Sorbonne). [Peuples et civilisations, Histoire générale, publiée sous la direction de Louis Halphen et Philippe Sagnac, tome VI.] (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1932. Pp. 609. 60 fr.)

To cover almost every important aspect of European civilization during the significant twelfth and thirteenth centuries is a difficult task. Professor Halphen has succeeded in doing this in a book which is remarkably accurate, clear, and interesting. His survey is especially commendable for the spirited and forceful manner in which the story is told and the skillful way in which the many parts have been subordinated to his main theme—the development of Europe. The author has omitted nothing of importance; he has, moreover, included many topics usually left for more specialized books.

This volume is divided into five sections and has in all thirty chapters, which are supplemented by a few pages of introduction and a conclusion. The first three chapters give a brief, but vivid picture of the eleventh century prior to the First Crusade. The chapter on Feudalism, only twenty pages in length, is excellent, as is that describing the Economic Revolution of the Twelfth Century. Thoroughly familiar with the results of recent scholarship it is here that Professor Halphen admirably displays his ability to explain with clarity and vigor phenomena which are complex and frequently baffling. In chapters II. and VII. the struggles between the Church and lay powers are discussed with equal sympathy for the contesting parties. The great personalities of both sides are vividly portrayed, and the issues at stake are analyzed with remarkable precision.

Book II. deals almost exclusively with the development of the great European monarchies; however two chapters describe the contemporary history of the Byzantine Empire and the Latin States in Syria, including brief accounts of the Second and Third Crusades. Ten pages reserved for the history of the Capetians to 1180 are scarcely adequate; probably with the needs of Continental readers in mind greater space has been given to English affairs during the twelfth century. Deserving of special mention is chapter VI., a survey of Iberian history from the age of the Cid to Las Navas de Tolosa. The author's powers of interpretation and synthesis are more evident in Book III., the Attempts to Unify Europe during the First Half of the Thirteenth

The English Church and the Papacy, from the Conquest to the Reign of John. By Z. N. Brooke, M.A., Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1931. Pp. xii, 260. $3.25.)

The title under which Professor Brooke publishes his Birkbeck Lectures of 1929–1931 is somewhat misleading, for he is primarily concerned here with the bearing of the canon law of the period upon the relations between the English Church and Rome. Within this narrower field it is an admirably clear and effective survey. There are three parts, an introduction, the purpose of which "is to elucidate the meaning of the phrase 'the English Church' . . . in the period"; Part I., the Law of the Church in England; Part II., the Relations of England with the Papacy. The author accepts Hubert Walter's definition of the English Church—"that portion of the Church which the Most High has planted in England", and argues that to follow the relations of this portion of the Church with the papacy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, it is first necessary to determine what was the existing law of the English Church. In Part I., through a difficult manuscript study the author traces the development of canon law in England, "almost with precision as far as the second half of the eleventh century is concerned; in less distinct outline, though with more material, in the first half of the twelfth century; and perfectly clearly again in the second half of the twelfth century and onwards". All the collections of canon law, as they came into general use on the Continent, appeared in England as well, and neither in the range of its canonical literature, nor in the activity of its councils, did the English Church approach a separate body of church law. The English Church recognized the same law as the rest of the Church—it possessed and used the same collections of church law that were employed in the rest of the Church; there is no evidence that the English Church in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was governed by laws selected by itself. Part II. rapidly sketches the relations between England and the papacy from Lanfranc through Thomas Becket, with an epilogue to Magna Carta. Lanfranc agreed with William the Conquerer in opposing the novel idea of a centralized Church directly controlled in all its parts by the pope, and archbishop and king were supported by unanimous ecclesiastical opinion in England. With St. Anselm there arose a papal party in England, and Henry I. maintained royal control only with difficulty. When Stephen guaranteed freedom to the Church, that is, freedom to obey the laws of the Church, especially the new reforming decrees, the English Church drew perceptibly nearer to Rome. After the unfortunate death of Thomas Becket, Henry II. was unable to regain the ground lost by his predecessor; how completely canon law had won the victory is shown by the fact that among the four hundred decretals of Alexander III. in the *Decretales* of Gregory IX., there are more addressed to the English Church than to all the rest of Europe. And in Magna Carta the king's first promise

is to allow freedom of election to the English Church. The appendix furnishes a valuable list of English manuscripts containing collections of ecclesiastical law and the index is adequate. It is in Part I. that the most significant contribution has been made to the literature of the subject, though the book as a whole has the great (and rare) merit of giving the English Church its proper place in medieval Christendom.

The University of California. PAUL SCHAEFFER.

L'essor de l'Europe, XI^e^–XIII^e^ siècles. Par LOUIS HALPHEN, professeur honoraire à l'Université de Bordeaux, directeur à L'École des Hautes Études historiques et philologiques (Sorbonne). [Peuples et civilisations, Histoire générale, publiée sous la direction de Louis Halphen et Philippe Sagnac, tome VI.] (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1932. Pp. 609. 60 fr.)

To cover almost every important aspect of European civilization during the significant twelfth and thirteenth centuries is a difficult task. Professor Halphen has succeeded in doing this in a book which is remarkably accurate, clear, and interesting. His survey is especially commendable for the spirited and forceful manner in which the story is told and the skillful way in which the many parts have been subordinated to his main theme—the development of Europe. The author has omitted nothing of importance; he has, moreover, included many topics usually left for more specialized books.

This volume is divided into five sections and has in all thirty chapters, which are supplemented by a few pages of introduction and a conclusion. The first three chapters give a brief, but vivid picture of the eleventh century prior to the First Crusade. The chapter on Feudalism, only twenty pages in length, is excellent, as is that describing the Economic Revolution of the Twelfth Century. Thoroughly familiar with the results of recent scholarship it is here that Professor Halphen admirably displays his ability to explain with clarity and vigor phenomena which are complex and frequently baffling. In chapters II. and VII. the struggles between the Church and lay powers are discussed with equal sympathy for the contesting parties. The great personalities of both sides are vividly portrayed, and the issues at stake are analyzed with remarkable precision.

Book II. deals almost exclusively with the development of the great European monarchies; however two chapters describe the contemporary history of the Byzantine Empire and the Latin States in Syria, including brief accounts of the Second and Third Crusades. Ten pages reserved for the history of the Capetians to 1180 are scarcely adequate; probably with the needs of Continental readers in mind greater space has been given to English affairs during the twelfth century. Deserving of special mention is chapter VI., a survey of Iberian history from the age of the Cid to Las Navas de Tolosa. The author's powers of interpretation and synthesis are more evident in Book III., the Attempts to Unify Europe during the First Half of the Thirteenth

Century. The Great War of the West, culminating in Bouvines, is brilliantly described in chapter I. Chapter III., Pontifical Theocracy—Innocent III., and chapter V., The Imperial Idea—Frederick II., are more than mere narrative essays. Chapter VII., The States of Eastern Europe on the Eve of the Mongol Offensive, furnishes a brief introduction to Book IV., Mongol Asia and Europe.

Orientalists may not agree with all that Professor Halphen has to say concerning the history of Asia, but students of European history should be grateful for the brilliant sketch that they will find here. Though writing of Asia, the author has Europe constantly in mind, and advanced students, as well as beginners will do well to read these pages. Europe during the second half of the thirteenth century is covered in Book V. The crystal-like brilliance of the twelfth century is no more; the vital forces of the early thirteenth century are spent; the chronicler writes a dismal tale. Though his theme becomes more and more complex Professor Halphen's pen does not fail him. Chapter I., Germany after the death of Frederick II., and chapter II., Angevin Italy (1250–1282) are good; however, the most important sections of this book are one devoted to Charles of Anjou and Mediterranean politics, that describing economic changes, and a significant essay discussing new tendencies in intellectual life. The volume ends in a reflective mood, with the author contemplating the historical importance of the year 1285.

There are useful bibliographies placed at the beginning of each chapter, and frequently additional references are appended to the smaller sections. These are not mere lists of books, for the important works are evaluated critically and often topics worthy of investigation are indicated (*cf.* p. 475). Books written in English have been somewhat slighted. Although referred to generally, more frequent direct references should have been given for the later volumes of the *Cambridge Medieval History*. Stenton's *First Century of English Feudalism,* which appeared too late to be included, must be added on page 3; Joan Evans's *Monastic Life at Cluny,* Lucy Smith's various studies, and Kenneth Conant's articles on Excavations at Cluny (*Speculum* IV., V., VI.) belong in the lists on page 24.

The following suggestions are given, though with no attempt to detract from the merits of this book: p. 55, there is a new edition of Dozy, revised by Lévi-Provençal (Leyden, 1932); p. 61, certainly Krey's *First Crusade,* Munro's articles, and *The Crusades and Other Essays presented to Dana C. Munro,* as well as E. Barker's general survey in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* are necessary supplements to the older books on the Crusades mentioned here, as is La Monte's study on the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem (1932) to the volumes cited on page 73; p. 97, Sarton's second volume appeared in 1931 and should be cited especially on page 561; the author's too generous appraisal of Abailard on page 103 might have been modified had he seen J. G. Sikes's *Peter Abailard* (1932); surely Baldwin's *Medieval Rhetoric,* P. H. Allen's *Romanesque Lyric,*

Helen Waddell's studies, and Faral's *Les arts poétiques* belong on pages 103–104; Mâle's polemical, war-time *Art allemand* does not deserve to be included on page 108; p. 113, W. R. W. Stephens is the co-author of the last title cited; Haskins's *Normans* belongs on page 155, and for this chapter the attention of Continental readers should have been drawn to Gross's *Sources and Literature* which is nowhere mentioned in the sections pertaining to England; W. A. Morris's *The English Sheriff,* his *Constitutional History of England,* and Z. N. Brooke's *The English Church and the Papacy,* take precedence over certain titles included on page 170; p. 201, Orientalists prefer Hitti's *Usāmah* (New York, 1929); p. 316, read A. S. Turberville; the survey of works dealing with the Ottoman Turks contributed to this *Review* (April, 1932) by Professors Langer and Blake must supplement page 393; p. 447, K. Asakawa's *Documents of Iriki* (New Haven, 1929) is of prime importance for Japan; though the pages devoted to the universities are admirable for their comprehensiveness and lucidity, the bibliographies on pages 545 and 549 are not adequate.

To include a brief survey of literature and art in a volume such as this was almost a necessity, yet the sections devoted to these topics are unfortunately the least satisfactory of all the essays. Frequently space allows only a series of author's names with the titles of their works. Here, it is true, medieval France deserves the greater emphasis, but the very slight treatment of German and Italian contributions needs further explanation.

Princeton University. GRAY C. BOYCE.

Die italienische Politik Kaiser Friedrichs I. nach dem Frieden von Constanz, 1183–1189: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Reichspolitik und Reichsverwaltung der Staufer in Italien. Von Dr. HEINZ KAUFFMANN. [Greifswalder Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters.] (Greifswald: L. Bamberg. 1933. Pp. 201. 4.80 M.)

THIS work is the most recent contribution to the seventy year old controversy, begun by Julius Ficker as defender, and H. von Sybel as critic, of medieval imperial policy. The renewal of the controversy in the twentieth century may be associated with Dietrich Schäfer, who, in his *Deutsche Geschichte* (Jena, 1910), undertook to defend the Italian policy of the medieval emperors, and with Georg von Below, who has consistently identified himself with the critical views of Sybel. The Italian policy has found its ablest defenders in Karl Hampe, *Deutsche Kaisergeschichte* (Leipzig, 1908 ff.), and more recently in the various contributions of J. Haller, particularly his *Altdeutsches Kaisertum* (Stuttgart, 1926). The works of Walter Lenel, *Der konstanzer Friede von 1183 und die italienische Politik Friedrich Barbarossas* (Hist. Zeit., CXXVIII. 189 ff.), and Georg von Below, *Die italienische Kaiserpolitik des deutschen Mittelalters mit besonderem Hinblick auf die Politik Friedrich Barbarossas* (Munich, 1927) have inten-

sified the controversy during the last decade. In so far as Lenel minimized the importance of the Peace of Constance, Below employed the conclusions of the latter to sustain his own negative judgment that the Peace of Constance was "ein Fiasko der Politik Friedrichs" (p. 107). Contrary to this view, Kauffmann, regarding the peace as a pivotal point of the imperial policy in Italy, sees in it the means of securing what Frederick Barbarossa had long sought, the firm establishment of the imperial authority in Italy. Henceforth the Lombard League was pledged to protect the imperial possessions. With the league on the side of the emperor, the most dangerous foe of the imperial policy, the papacy, was compelled to acquiesce in the accomplished fact.

To those who minimize the significance of the Peace of Constance (for example, Below) Frederick failed in that his achievements in 1183 fell far short of his plans in 1158. Kauffmann, on the other hand, while recognizing the significance of the emperor's concessions, concludes that "the price of this valuable aid of the North Italian communes was not too high". Even though a large measure of autonomy remained in the Lombard communes, permitting to the prince a bare "Oberhoheit", the invariable and unqualified recognition of this supremacy was to make it often the decisive factor in determining the outcome of local differences. Moreover, it was the means of extending the financial and military dominance of the empire throughout Italy, of making the central Italian cities enclaves within the imperial territory, and finally, of beginning the establishment of immediate "Reichsprovinzen" in Piedmont, in the mark of Verona, in the passes of the Apennines, and on the Tyrrhenian and Adriatic seas.

In view of the thorough, although less favorable researches of Lenel, it is the peculiar merit, perhaps, indeed, the sole justification of Kauffmann's dissertation that he has reconstructed "mosaic-wise" the variegated local transactions through which the Peace of Constance served as the matrix for the structure of the new imperial authority in Italy in the years 1183–1187. One may take issue with his overemphasis upon the Peace of Constance as an "Angelpunkt" in the Italian policy, preferring, rather, to regard it merely as one of two hinges of this policy, while stressing no less the attempt to effect a lasting peace with the curia. For, while Kauffmann's treatment of the papal-imperial conflict through these years is admirable as to detail, he hastens too readily to the conclusion that the year 1187 was an "Einschnitt" in that it marked the return of Italy in general "in den Belangen der Reichspolitik". This judgment tends to overlook the fact that the desired peace between emperor and pope, so necessary to the permanent establishment of imperial authority, was not, even after the agreement of 1189, an accomplished fact. After the sudden death of Frederick the papal opposition to the imperial authority continued unbroken, not in "neue Wege eingeschlagen", but precisely along the lines which it had followed throughout the preceding years.

As to documentation, the dissertation leaves little to be desired. At times his citations are perhaps needlessly exhaustive. It contains an excellent table of contents, a well-arranged and complete bibliography, and a valuable appendix. On the whole, it is a significant contribution, probably the ablest justification of Frederick's conciliatory policy toward the league in 1183.

Bowdoin College. THOMAS C. VAN CLEVE.

Radulphi de Hengham Summae. Edited by WILLIAM HUSE DUNHAM, JR., Fellow of Saybrook College and Assistant Professor of History, Yale University. [Cambridge Studies in English Legal History, edited by Harold Dexter Hazeltine.] (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. lxxxiv, 94. $2.75.)

HENGHAM'S tracts on legal procedure, the *Summa Magna* and *Summa Parva* were first printed in connection with Selden's edition of Fortescue's *De Laudibus,* and with Selden's notes, in 1616—a result of that great revival of interest in constitutional and legal history which marked the early years of the Stuarts. Selden's edition has been reprinted five times with no important changes, the last time in 1775. The present edition, as Professor Hazeltine remarks, is "one of the out-growths of that epoch-making renaissance of historical studies in English law inaugurated by the researches of Brunner, Maitland, Ames and other scholars of the recent past". It is one of the very necessary and newly edited texts in this field of which Professor Woodbine's Glanville and Bracton are such notable examples; and it is interesting to note that Dr. Dunham has begun work on the *Casus,* an earlier tract which Hengham used. Hengham's tracts were almost constantly employed as practical procedural guides from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century, in the early years the text often altered by copyists and glossators to fit new conditions. Dr. Dunham has based his edition on one of the texts in the British Museum, with important alternate readings in the notes, after a study of seventy-five of some value, many of the worthless having been sifted out. But even the best manuscripts are "quite remote from any hypothetical original—at least three or four generations".

A biographical sketch contains a critical examination of the meager data on the career of Chief Justice Hengham, and shows that the *Summa Magna* was written between 1272 and 1275 and that its author was familiar with Glanville, Bracton, and other earlier writings and drew much from his own experience in the courts; and that the *Parva* dates from between 1285 and 1290, and is to no small extent a commentary on the Statute of Westminster II. of the former year. The editor believes there is little evidence that Hengham wrote the various other legal tracts which have been traditionally ascribed to him, but that such ascription has rightfully singled him out as "the pre-eminent legal writer of his day".

Professor Hazeltine, the general editor of the series, has prefaced this volume with a highly instructive and readable essay on Hengham's Place in Legal Literature, of which no adequate mention can be made in this review. It contains a summary account of the legal renaissance as reflected in legal writings in Italy, Spain, Germany, France, and England; and especially of that transfer of interest from substantive to adjective law which flowered in the procedural tracts of Edward I.'s time—the tracts which must be studied along with the Registers of Writs and the Year Books to measure what strains were Germanic and what were Roman and canonical, and how these combined and contributed to the various departments of England's law. This essay should point the way to much further work in legal history.

The University of Minnesota. A. B. White.

BOOKS OF MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Florentine Merchants in the Age of the Medici: Letters and Documents from the Selfridge Collection of Medici Manuscripts. Edited by Gertrude Randolph Bramlette Richards. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1932. Pp. x, 342. $4.50.)

It is of real importance to the student of the Renaissance to receive a formal introduction to the Selfridge Collection of Manuscripts at present in the temporary charge of Harvard University. As described by Dr. Richards in a foreword to her work, these papers are the business records of a younger branch of the Medici family. The account books begin with those of Giovenco di Giuliano de' Medici, a distant cousin of the great Cosimo, and founder, during the first half of the fifteenth century, of the firm of Medici and Company, manufacturers and merchants in the Guild of Wool. The Medici Company continued in existence under changing forms of association throughout the greater part of the sixteenth century. The Selfridge Manuscripts fall into three main groups, account books, letter books, and letters. The account books, which are of great value for the history of business, include some 150 volumes. There are four letter books in unbroken sequence from 1500 to 1521, containing copies of letters sent to various agents of the firm in Italy, France, and the East. The unbound letters are of varying interest and authorship. As they are to be published independently, the editor of the present selection of papers has given no detailed description of them.

The most important letters and documents chosen for this study are those of Giovanni di Francesco Maringhi, agent in Constantinople for a number of Florentine firms. In regard to these, Dr. Richards has explained her principle of selection as follows: "Partly because of the repetition and partly because of the textual difficulties, it was decided to select one group of letters written all on one day to the more important Florentine firms whose interests Maringhi represented, and then one year's correspondence with Ser Niccolo Michelozzi,

his sponsor and friend as well as his most important principal." The decision to give one day's complete correspondence was particularly felicitous, affording as it does a glimpse into the complicated activities of a commercial agent in the Orient. Besides Maringhi's letters, the volume contains an inventory of his goods drawn up after his death in 1506, and some letters written by Raffaello di Francesco de' Medici to his representatives in the East during 1520 and 1521. One chapter presents four articles of association entered into by the firm from 1426 through 1525. Some examples of bills of exchange of a later date are given in the final chapter. The appendix is unusually well supplied with miscellaneous letters, charts, and glossaries, and the volume is provided with a full and well compiled bibliography.

The general political background of the period has been sketched in an introduction entitled Florence under the Medici. Here Dr. Richards expresses some interesting opinions. She maintains (p. 14) that the attainment of peace and freedom for artisans and merchants was the constant aim of the Florentine Republic. Beyond a doubt these objectives were sought for the merchant classes, but, in the opinion of this reviewer, the republican leaders were almost totally lacking in social consciousness concerning the welfare of the workers. Freedom, either economic or political, was not desired for them. The author holds Florentine individualism to blame for the failure of the republic, and regards the Medici with almost unmixed approval. One might question her assertion (p. 21) that the decline in the authority of the Church began with the election of Alexander VI. to the papacy. It is a little disconcerting, moreover, to be confronted with such forthright declarations as that Alexander VI. died "of poison"; or that Ippolito de' Medici was "murdered by Alessandro"; or this, in reference to Ottaviano de' Medici: "It is strange that Clement did not appoint him rather than the two degenerates, Ippolito and Alessandro, to govern Florence". Is all reverence dead toward these venerable historical wrangles?

The introduction to industrial conditions is well presented. Some trifling slips in the numbering of footnotes (pp. 39, 40) and in translation (*i.e., affettatori,* p. 42) should be checked. The note on the dyers (pp. 42–43) is, however, really misleading. It is very doubtful whether the great cloth guilds were always able to keep their dyers completely separate from one another, much as they sought to do so. Dr. Richards seems to imply that the condition she describes was a permanent one. The dyers were able at different times to enact their own regulations regarding materials, technical methods, and tariffs. This semi-independence was broken up, but they enjoyed a more favorable position than most artisans as can be seen from a study of their tariff schedules and the tax lists throughout the fifteenth and into the sixteenth century.

It is inevitable that the first edition and first printing made from manuscripts so difficult to decipher (see the photographs opposite pp. 60, 96, 188),

and demanding such varied and such highly specialized knowledge on the part of the editor, should stand in need of much revision. The present review has been long postponed awaiting the receipt of Dr. Richards's own corrections. Eight pages of *Errata* have been received. Some of the changes in translation have completely altered the significance of the text, and many of the doubtful points have been cleared. But some obvious mistakes remain uncorrected.

The original location of the Medici *bottega* is, perhaps, of no momentous significance, but in relation to the records of the Medici firm it becomes an interesting detail. One is at a loss to understand Dr. Richards's conflicting statements regarding it. She says repeatedly that the original shop was on the Via Maggio (pp. 8, 51, 58, 228, 232, etc.) but she also insists that it was in the Convento San Martino. Three times (pp. 58, 228, 232) she even asserts that the Convento San Martino was on the Via Maggio. The Convento San Martino was the most important of the four *conventi,* or wool manufacturing districts, into which Florence was divided. It was in the vicinity of Orsammichele, while the Via Maggio was the center of another wool district, called the Convento Oltrarno. The confusion here may have arisen from the fact that San Martino cloth could be made and sold in both of these *conventi.* But obviously the original Medici shop must have been one or the other. Since the earliest articles of association (p. 232) state that the company resided in the Convento San Martino, it seems likely that the *bottega* in the Via Maggio was opened at a later date, and that Dr. Richards has not come upon the exact location of the original shop.

One should call attention to some of the other errors not mentioned in the *Errata.* The editor has suggested (p. 83) that a certain piece of cloth of three *liccj* may mean cloth that is three-ply. In the glossary she has translated this term, in part, as "with three strands". This word was variously used in weaving, but it seems likely that in this connection it refers to the levers or pedals of the loom, manipulated in the weaving of patterns, and that the cloth in question was of complex pattern rather than three-ply. No correction has been made of the confused explanation of the mercantile signs under the photograph opposite page 60. Footnotes 1 and 2 on page 229 are transposed. In the glossary of business terms one might question that translation of *chomerchio,* some of the types of *seta,* and *tenpo.* The attribution of *Della Decima* to Balducci-Pegolotti has been corrected in the footnotes, but not in the bibliography.

The published *Errata* should be constantly used with these documents and letters. The editor has disavowed the transcription of the instructions to the agent, Risaliti (appendix B), explaining that it was given to the publisher by mistake from a faulty copy. She has not attempted to revise chapter VI. on the articles of association which she finds in need of alteration, but which is soon to be made the subject of a detailed study based upon the materials in

the Selfridge Collection. The bills of exchange set forth in chapter VII. might also be further enlarged and studied.

It is, generally speaking, an easy task for the critic to suggest corrections in a work of this specialized character, based upon documents the very transcription of which may remain a debatable matter for some time. Such criticisms should not obscure the usefulness of this volume in introducing the student to the Selfridge Manuscripts, and giving the general reader a fascinating glimpse of the vitality and interest of early modern commerce. This work bears evidence of haste. A second edition, embodying all necessary changes, would be of real value. Economic studies of this period in English are all too few.

Goucher College. KATHARINE JEANNE GALLAGHER.

L'élément historique dans la controverse religieuse du XVI^e siècle. Par PONTIEN POLMAN, O.F.M., Th.D., professeur d'Histoire ecclésiastique à Wychen (Pays-Bas). (Gembloux: J. Ducolot. 1932. Pp. xxxvi, 580.)

WHILE erudition, in several quarters, is still devoid of the historical sense and modern historians occasionally show pique because of the lack of it on the part of some in their own profession, it is rather encouraging to find in an age when passions and prejudices were too largely dominant, and before there emerged any self-conscious historical method, such proof of the existence of this sense in the religious controversies of the sixteenth century. The reviewer does not recall any use of this phrase in this book, but the term, historical sense, seems the best synonym in English of what the author designates 'L'élément historique'. While the dissertation does not meet all the demands of a history of the theological literature of the Reformation era, it is a very valuable critical contribution to such a history and is likely to be a stimulus to the interests aroused, for example, by Preserved Smith, Albert Hyma, and Hastings Eells.

Following a brief preface and an extensive bibliography (pp. xiv–xxxvi) the body of the work is almost equally divided between two books dealing respectively with the Protestant and (Roman) Catholic writers and writings. Each book consists of two sections, 'The Accumulation of the Materials' in which the literature is considered as belonging to the 'History of Dogma' or to the 'History of the Church', and 'The Synthesis of the Materials'. The chief theological works of the leading Reformers and their immediate disciples are examined with special attention to their recognition of the historical factors. There is a similar survey of the chief Protestant histories of the Church written in the sixteenth century. Likewise the leading works in dogmatics and church history by the Catholic writers of the period are examined. There is a chapter devoted to the Magdeburg Centuriators, while one presenting the *Annales* of Cardinal Baronius may be considered as some-

what countervailing. Polman, however, estimates the latter as less adequate than the former for their respective purposes. The blending of analytical and comparative treatment is carried along with lucidity and on the whole with eminent fairness. The author recognizes that Protestants as well as Catholics made an appeal to the past and herein lies the possibility of an even more profound synthesis than that disclosed and expounded in this dissertation.

The peril is not altogether escaped, however, which Polman thinks befell Zwingli and Œcolampadius (p. 64), who were not entirely successful in freeing themselves from their own dogmatic convictions when they tried to interpret the patristic texts. It was a little disconcerting, in a work which is so objective and scientifically discriminating and which recognizes so much validity in other schools of thought, to read (p. 32) in reference to Melanchthon's "culte des bonae litterae et la passion de la beata tranquillitas" that "il n'avait rien d'un démagogue du type de Luther". In the treatment of the theological disputants of the sixteenth century, the critic should differentiate, on both sides, between two types of forensics, the dexterous thrust—cleverness instead of wisdom—to meet the attack of the moment, and the habitual form of a writer's polemic or apologetic system and method. Luther used both. Failure to discern this has led to the accusation of insincerity.

The index will be found serviceable, while the approximately 1250 footnotes—bibliographical, critical, with abundant quotations—open up many themes for further study.

The Library of Congress. WILLIAM H. ALLISON.

Sir Philip Sidney. By MONA WILSON. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1932. Pp. 328. $3.75.)

THIS is a good biography of Sidney. It adds almost nothing to the known facts about his life, but there is little or nothing to be added. Professor M. W. Wallace spoke virtually the last word on this subject some eighteen years ago. Since that time the three most promising regions for new material upon Sidney's life have been carefully explored. Mrs. Lomas, before she died, completed her excellent calendars of the foreign state papers in the English Public Record Office beyond the date of Sidney's death. M. Feuillerat in 1923 published a very complete edition of Sidney's extant letters. Mr. C. L. Kingsford in 1925 edited carefully the pertinent material in the papers at Penshurst, and only two years ago Dr. Brugmans printed *in extenso* what we must regard as an exhaustive collection of unpublished material in Dutch archives relative to Sidney's career in the Low Countries (*A. H. R.*, XXXVII. 312).

Most of the recent work on Sidney which can in any sense be considered a definite addition to our knowledge of the subject has to do with an analysis of his writings and is based upon the assumption that there is autobiographical material contained in his poetry and in his *Arcadia*. The *Astrophel and Stella*

sonnet sequence offers the obvious point of attack and has furnished a battle-ground for biographers and critics for well over a century, some maintaining that these sonnets were little more than literary exercises following the pattern of the Petrarchists in Italy and France, others that they were the record of a positive love affair between Sidney and Penelope Rich. William Hazlitt sat on one side of this fence, Charles Lamb on the other. H. R. Fox Bourne, whose scholarly biography, first published seventy-one years ago, still remains the basis of all subsequent treatises on Sidney's life, supported the unromantic position, and Sir Sidney Lee insisted upon it. But the drift of more recent opinion is in the other direction. Professor Wallace maintains that the sonnets were frankly autobiographical, Miss Emma Marshall Denkinger, who published a rather sentimental life of Sidney two years ago, is quite sure of it, and Miss Wilson in the volume before us reaches the same conclusion. It may be so. But there is no way of proving it, and almost nothing in what we otherwise know of Philip's relations with Penelope to support it. As Miss Wilson says, every reader of the sonnets must decide the question for himself. It becomes a matter of taste, and there is no disputing tastes, least of all in love poetry.

Quite recently students of literature have been wrestling with the *Arcadia* in something like the same spirit and have professed to find in it reflections of a political attitude in Sidney decidedly at variance with the orthodox Tudor position (*cf.* W. D. Briggs in *Studies in Philology,* XXVIII. (1931) 137 ff.; XXIX. (1932) 534 ff.; W. G. Zeeveld in *Modern Language Notes,* XLVIII. (1933) 209 ff.). One elaborate treatise on the subject maintains that the *Arcadia* reveals a marked sympathy with the political ideals set forth in the well-known anonymous pamphlet *Vindiciae contra tyrannos.* The argument is not convincing, and Miss Wilson, if she has considered it at all, has rejected it. Her summary of Sidney's political views seems to the reviewer to come much nearer the mark: "Sidney's political faith, as revealed in the *Arcadia,* was as simple as his religion. He accepted as heartily as Spenser or Shakespeare the Tudor ideal of a nation united in love and allegiance to its natural princess and a throne supported by a loyal nobility, a dutiful gentry, an honest, industrious and obedient commonalty" (p. 153).

Miss Wilson's discussion of Sidney's political career is an adequate statement of the known facts. Some aspects of it invite further research. Sidney's efforts to build up a Protestant league in Germany in the seventies deserve more careful attention than they have so far received, not so much because of his share in them as because they reveal certain fundamental weaknesses in the whole Protestant position. And the material which Dr. Brugmans has published from the Dutch archives bearing upon Sidney's brief career as governor of Flushing must not be neglected by future biographers. It did not appear in time to be utilized by Miss Wilson. Possibly had Sidney lived longer he might have won a distinguished place for himself in Elizabeth's

government. But that is by no means certain. He was too upright for a politician and too self-respecting to play the courtier's game as Raleigh and Essex played it. Miss Wilson is right in singling out his writings as his most important concrete achievement. Yet he hardly lives to-day in his writings. Nobody reads the *Arcadia* now, and only one or two of his sonnets are remembered except by those who make the history of English literature their business. What chiefly distinguished him among his contemporaries and what has won for him an almost unique place in the memory of Englishmen was his beauty of character. He was, as Shelley put it, a spirit without spot. Miss Wilson, in her concluding chapter, has paid ample tribute to his essential fineness, but one wishes that she had made even more of it. One feels that his fineness was at once his glory and his undoing. He did not belong in the Elizabethan court; he did not belong among the offspring of the Dudley breed. The fundamental incompatibility between his character and his birthright explains perhaps why he made relatively little of exceptional abilities and exceptional opportunities. It may even be taken to explain the foolhardiness which led to his untimely death.

Miss Wilson has written a good book. It is not without small flaws—what good book ever is—but it is historically sound, admirably proportioned, and written with restraint and good taste. For the general reader it is, on the whole, the best biography of Sidney in print.

Philadelphia. CONYERS READ.

Le commerce français à Séville et Cadix au temps des Habsbourg: Contribution à l'étude du commerce étranger en Espagne aux XVI^e^ et XVII^e^ siècles. Par ALBERT GIRARD, professeur agrégé d'Histoire à l'Ecole Turgot. [Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études hispaniques, fasc. XVII.] (Paris: E. de Boccard. 1932. Pp. xxiii, 604. 50 fr.)

La rivalité commerciale et maritime entre Séville et Cadix jusqu'à la fin du XVIII^e^ siècle. Par ALBERT GIRARD. [Fasc. XVIII.] (Paris: E. de Boccard. 1932. Pp. xxvi, 119. 18 fr.)

THESE two volumes are a scholarly contribution to a field in which monographs are greatly needed. They treat in detail and extend in scope two aspects of the story that fifteen years ago was told in its general features by Professor C. H. Haring in his work on *Trade and Navigation between Spain and the Indies in the Time of the Hapsburgs.* One could wish a different title for the larger of the two volumes as the present one hardly does the contents justice. The work is not merely a study of the volume of French commerce that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries passed through Spain by way of Seville and Cadiz to the Spanish Indies, though aspects of this subject are dealt with in detail, but is also an examination of the organization, character, and volume of French commercial interests in the Spanish peninsula. Its greatest contribution is indeed in this latter section.

M. Girard emphasizes in his opening chapter the uniquely close bond that existed between Spain and her Indies and the determining influence of this relationship on Spanish domestic and foreign policy, and describes the influx of foreigners into the peninsula as Spain became the distributing center in the trade between Europe and America. With this beginning, he passes to an examination of Franco-Spanish commerce before and after the Treaty of the Pyrenees of 1659. In this convention France secured from Spain the coveted right of "most favored nation" treatment and the author takes this as his pivotal point. Prior to the sixteenth century, trade between France and Spain centered largely in an interchange of commodities between the ports of Brittany and Normandy and those of northwestern Spain, and M. Girard has some interesting comments on the Spanish colonies in France that sprang up in connection with this early trade. With the discovery of America, Andalusia became the center of commercial life in the peninsula, and Spanish trade, despite the unfavorable political background, became the most important branch of French commerce. The determination of France in the seventeenth century to secure by treaty a commercial position in Spain corresponding in privileges and advantages to that held in European politics in general, and the achievement of this in the Peace of the Pyrenees, were followed for the rest of the century, M. Girard points out, by a determined effort to exploit to the utmost, especially in the trade to the Indies, the concessions thus gained. How Spain brought about in practice a modification of the exorbitant provisions through inertia and later by various devices and practices forms the subject of a chapter.

In the course of the story thus told, M. Girard produces a number of valuable studies of the organization and development of a French consular system, the growth of special privileges, particularly juridical ones, enjoyed by foreign merchants in Spain, the functions of the *juges conservateurs,* sea routes and ports and their historical development, the character of French goods used in Spain, the nature of Spanish importations into France, the amount of the precious metals arriving from the Indies, the frauds associated with their export and the nature of French exports to the Indies.

The smaller volume, *La rivalité commerciale et maritime entre Séville et Cadix jusqu'à la fin du XVIII^e^ siècle,* is a natural outgrowth of the larger study for it was the trade with the Indies with its demand for heavy tonnage and its *flota* system which forced the river port of Seville, handicapped by a natural bar across the mouth of the Guadalquivir at San Lucar, to give ground before its more fortunately placed maritime rival, Cadiz. M. Girard points out that the growth of Cadiz paralleled the increasing participation of foreigners in the American traffic. As Spanish industry became more and more incapable of coping with the needs of the colonial trade, and as it became more and more difficult to force foreign merchants to make the long, slow journey to Seville, Cadiz naturally became the center of commerce as well as

the head of the line of navigation. Frauds incident to this commerce and the efforts of farseeing Spaniards to cope with the evils are phases of the study. There is an especially useful chapter of conclusions to this volume.

Students of Spanish history have long regretted that the wealth of material hidden in the rich vein of the consular papers has hitherto been so lightly tapped. To a considerable extent M. Girard has met this need in his chosen field. These volumes are based primarily on French sources, particularly on the correspondence carried on between the French government and its consuls in Spain, especially between the consul general in Cadiz and the French ministers, as well as on a great wealth of memoir material. The municipal archives of Seville and Cadiz have been examined and the larger collections at Madrid, Simancas, and the Archive of the Indies at Seville have been consulted, though the latter has been by no means exhausted.

The style is admirably clear and fluent, incident and principle are kept distinct. There are frequent summaries of the detailed material and conclusions are frankly arrived at and plainly stated. There is a map and an extensive bibliography in each volume.

Smith College. VERA L. BROWN.

Burned Books: Neglected Chapters in British History and Literature. By CHARLES RIPLEY GILLETT, Librarian Emeritus of Union Theological Seminary. Two volumes. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1932. Pp. ix, 356; 359–723. $10.00.)

ENTHUSIASM over the newly discovered art of printing was still at its height when governments began to set themselves to the task of protecting their peoples from the perils that lay in the printed word. Monarchs and ministers, estates and parliaments, grew tremulous at the thought of sedition pouring from the press and poisoning the public mind. After the Reformation new presbyter no less zealously than old priest invoked the aid of the secular power against the spread of irreligious notions. Edicts were promulgated, statutes enacted, censors appointed, police set to work hunting presses, confiscating volumes and arraigning printers and booksellers—gentry held as culpable as authors, and more easily tracked to earth. So elaborate and changing were the regulations, so many and confusing the agencies of suppression, that no investigator has told the complete tale for any region, although admirable studies have been made for restricted periods. Some day perhaps there will stand on library shelves a row of compact volumes, each of which will give for a single country a well-documented account of the legislation, the machinery for enforcement, the procedure and effectiveness of the censorship, from the sixteenth century to our own day.

Meanwhile everyone who digs into the rich soil at any point is rewarded. Dr. Gillett has chosen seventeenth century England, with introductory chap-

ters on the Tudors and a final section on Anne and the Hanoverians. His work bears testimony to leisurely reading in the pages of nearly one hundred books and pamphlets which, if governments were as well served as their legislation assumes, would never have survived to adorn the shelves at the Union Theological Seminary occupied by the McAlpin Collection. The author, whose impressive catalogue of that collection has already made students his debtors, was impelled by this reading to further investigations. He deals for the most part with governmental suppression, but occasionally has allowed himself to be diverted by such a fulmination as the famous *Judgment and Decree of the University of Oxford*, which provides one of the facsimile pages that adorn his well-printed volumes. As his title indicates, he has confined himself, with a few minor exceptions, to books disposed of in the practical and symbolically effective manner sanctioned by Paul at Ephesus.

His search resulted in a list of some four hundred titles, but his aim went far beyond the compilation of a check list of books condemned to the flames. He has sought to place each condemnation in its historical setting, giving as much information as possible concerning circumstances and motives. He has not always been fortunate in the authorities on whom he has depended for interpretation of the period. To portray the Presbyterians as believers in republicanism (pp. 7, 603, 626) and Laud as "a most unscrupulous plotter" (p. 135), is misleading, and it is unfortunate to perpetuate such hoary errors as the belief that Charles I. wrote the *Eikon Basilike* (p. 433), that the Old Pretender was a supposititious child (pp. 542, 552, 635), and that the Massachusetts authorities ever burned witches (p. 258). He has occasionally accepted too readily a bibliographical ascription, as that assigning the *Speech lately made by a Noble Peer* (p. 494) to its printer, who was quite incapable of writing it.

However, errors of this nature are embedded in a large amount of curious and interesting information, both bibliographical and historical, and the extensive quotations from publications not easily accessible make this contribution to a neglected field of genuine value to the student.

Vassar College. LOUISE FARGO BROWN.

Les États de Bretagne de 1661 à 1789. Par ARMAND REBILLON, professeur à l'Université de Rennes. (Paris: Auguste Picard. 1932. Pp. 825. 60 fr.)

Les sources de l'histoire des États de Bretagne. Par ARMAND REBILLON, professeur à l'Université de Rennes. (Paris: Auguste Picard. 1932. Pp. 100. 6 fr.)

SCHOLARS interested in the provincial history of France will find much valuable information in this volume. Dealing with the estates of Brittany, it throws light on the political and social aspects of the Old Régime in the province and opens up a wealth of materials, hitherto neglected. The fact

that the estates of this province, like the similar organization in Languedoc, was the most influential of all the provincial estates adds to the importance of the book.

This volume covers an important period in the history of the estates (1661–1789). In it the writer shows how that body, threatened with extinction during the reign of Louis XIV., regained its "autonomy" during the subsequent administrations and exerted marked influence upon political and social developments. In discussing the "autonomy" enjoyed by Brittany, the author, however, very carefully states that limited independence did not signify the existence of a national movement bent upon the creation of an independent nation. Rather, it denoted opposition to the Old Régime—an opposition similar to that which existed in other provinces.

The work consists of an introduction and three general divisions. In the former the author traces the evolution of the estates from its origin to 1661. In Part I. he deals with the organization and the composition of the estates, discussing the method of selection and the duties of its officers. In Part II. he emphasizes the financial and administrative prerogatives of the estates and the relations of that institution with the monarchy and with other provincial organizations—especially the parlement. One chapter is devoted to the origin and importance of the *Commission intermédiaire* and other committees which facilitated the work of the estates. Inasmuch as little has been written on this subject the author's treatment is of special significance. In the last part Professor Rebillon discusses the financial administration of the estates during the period 1661–1789, and shows how the political and administrative functions of that body were largely determined by this important activity. In short, the author has written a scholarly and interesting account of a very important phase of French institutional history.

In his researches dealing with the estates of Brittany, Professor Rebillon has examined a wealth of manuscripts and printed works which should be of value to scholars investigating various aspects of this subject. Moreover, to aid them the author has prepared an admirable bibliography.

This monograph contains not merely a list of contemporary materials dealing with the history of the estates of Brittany from 1492 to 1791, but it also includes discussions of the contents and relative importance of the materials available. In the first chapter the author describes the various types of documents, emphasizing the ones he considers most important. In the following chapters he discusses the significant materials under these classifications: Memoirs, general treatises relating to Brittany and its administration, works dealing with the royal authority, and the leading histories of the estates and its administration. On the whole the author's judgments in the selection and descriptions of material are sound. His bibliography should be of service to the scholar interested in provincial history.

The University of California. FRANKLIN C. PALM.

England under Queen Anne. By GEORGE MACAULAY TREVELYAN, O.M., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. Volume II., *Ramillies and the Union with Scotland.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1932. Pp. xiv, 468. $5.00.)

"THIS volume", says Mr. Trevelyan in his preface, "is a rope twisted of three strands—the war, English politics and the Scottish problem. The close interconnection of the three are the special interest and difficulty of the historian." But so skillfully and confidently are the strands twisted that few readers will guess where the knots lay. Probably it was easier to unwind the story of the defense of Gibraltar and the battles of Ramillies and Oudenarde than to smooth out for printing the wild tangle of Scottish faction. If Mr. Trevelyan has devoted the greater space to the war on land and sea, his excellent sense of history has compelled him to find in the Union the most important achievement of the middle years of Queen Anne's reign, and to invest its telling with fine sympathy and seriousness. Perhaps the two chapters on the state of Scotland lack the easy at-homeness of the introduction to eighteenth century England in the first volume, and, careful of Scottish sensibilities as they are, suggest that the writer found Jacobites, Highlanders, Cameronians, and the Kirk itself forbiddingly un-English. "Whatever its other faults", he remarks justly but lukewarmly, "the Church of John Knox raised the downtrodden people of Scotland to look its feudal masters in the face" (p. 206). Indeed, Mr. Trevelyan is half-apologetic over the harsh picture of pride, squalor, and bigotry which the evidence—the most damning, of course, from the pens of Englishmen who ventured over the Border—requires of him, and softens it on several pages with allusions to better times a-coming.

In the scheme of this work a Continental war over a vast theater becomes an integral part of England's history. The genius of Marlborough, the supremacy of the English navy, the responsible rôle of English finance, unquestionably assigned to England first place among the Allies. As an Englishman Mr. Trevelyan is proud of that place, and of English performance in it. His admiration for the inerrancy of Marlborough's generalship, and for the fine qualities to which posterity has done so little justice, continues warm and even a little indignant. As a historian he makes handsome acknowledgment of the contributions of Dutch, Danes, and Brandenburgers to the triumph of the Allies, gives Queen Anne's ministry the rating it earned by the tragic failure to make peace in 1709, and admits that Marlborough might have acted with more decision in declining the government of Flanders, and with more honor in respect to a French bribe. The reader may differ from Mr. Trevelyan in degree of feeling on these matters, but will find his views reasonable.

In handling the third strand, domestic politics, Mr. Trevelyan's interest

seems to flag a little toward the end of the volume. Marlborough is away at the wars; Godolphin is trying to keep his place by alliance with the Whigs; Sarah is behaving very badly. Church, Cabinet, and Bedchamber are rent with feud; the chains of party government are fastening on poor Queen Anne, who prays to be delivered from the merciless men of both parties, but is not heard. These are unpromising materials, yet Mr. Trevelyan has done brilliantly with less when his sympathies were engaged. But in the years 1708–1709, politics were subterranean, mine and countermine, and politicians, including those in petticoats, had nice eyes to their own interests and to little else. The author's preference is for the "moderate men", but at this time they had no program except to remain in power. Party, in spite of excess of sound and fury, was to have something definite to say, in contrast to the caginess of Godolphin and Marlborough, and party government, upon its coming in, at least, was to be a victory of intelligibility. For Harley, Mr. Trevelyan manifests a distaste not altogether logical. He was a trickster, but weren't they all? Until Jacobitism should be definitely excised from practical politics no man of ambition could quite afford to be honest.

The reader of this volume will not, I think, lay it down without reflecting afresh on the aspect of history with which it is concerned. It is the aspect which interested most of the distinguished historians of the nineteenth century: history as the story of the state, and of the monarchs, ministers, bishops, generals, and other exalted pieces on the chessboard of public affairs. Mr. Trevelyan's work is not really a history of England under Queen Anne, but of government and public policy in that time. These are weighty matters and worthy to be recorded, but the governed, who have had their historical innings since John Richard Green, receive only a few side glances from Mr. Trevelyan. This is the more to be regretted because of his gift for seeing much in little, of which there are many illustrations in this volume. It is interesting to know that traveling in a splendid glass coach in the seventeenth century was hot work on a summer's day; interesting to catch glimpses of Newton and Wren in the Tower; of Queen Anne in the House of Lords against the background of the Armada tapestries; of the prototype of Robinson Crusoe on his island; of John Wesley at the age of five years almost forgotten in a burning house but rescued at last; of the death of a dog, poor Fubs, and the sorrow of his mistress. In these and other lightly sketched incidents and persons the time lives freshly, more so, perhaps, than in the retraced designs of Marlborough's victories.

Vassar College. VIOLET BARBOUR.

Mémoires du général de Caulaincourt, duc de Vicence, grand écuyer de l'Empereur. Introduction et notes de JEAN HANOTEAU. Tomes I., II., *L'ambassade de Saint-Pétersbourg et la campagne de Russie.* (Paris: Librairie Plon. 1933. Pp. 444, 409. 30 fr. each.)

THESE valuable memoirs, which were written by the principal exponent of peace in the last years of the Napoleonic empire as an answer to the apologia of Maret, seconder of the emperor's war policies, were seen in part by Thiers and were used by Albert Vandal for his *Napoléon et Alexandre Ier*. Now, at last, they have been published, with copious notes and a competent biographical preface, by M. Jean Hanoteau, editor of a recent edition of the memoirs of Queen Hortense. The first volume extends from Erfurt to the arrival of the French army at Moscow; the second carries the story up to Napoleon's departure from Paris for the German campaign of 1813. There is to be a third volume.

Volume I. exhibits the man whom Joseph de Maistre ironically called "the ambassador-general-duke-equerry" as anything but a stuffed shirt. Member of an ancient feudal family, inheritor of a strictly military tradition, brought up to the frank acceptance of the Revolution, Caulaincourt emerges from these pages as a man of strict principles, limited imagination, tremendous courage, an almost puritanical sense of duty, and military loyalty. Involved unjustly in the scandal of the Duc d'Enghien's abduction and execution, and embittered by accusation, he was condemned to spend his life trying to live with frankness, dignity, and honor, while serving loyally a master lacking in what the Caulaincourts would have called "principles". The effort led him into many a morass that the agile Talleyrand avoided; and M. Hanoteau's admiration for Caulaincourt's uprightness has inevitably led him to a somewhat unfruitful view of Talleyrand.

A brigadier general at thirty-one, the grand equerry was created Duc de Vicence in 1808. After Tilsit, he served against his will as ambassador to Russia, and conceived a great affection and respect for Alexander. He was finally relieved of his post in 1811. Because he worked for the Russian marriage, for the Russian alliance, and for a genuine European peace, Napoleon constantly charged him with having become a Russian. He was the Cassandra of the Russian war; and the most interesting conversations he reports in volume I. are those in which he vainly attempted to arrest the acceleration of wishful thinking which afflicted the emperor with greater and greater violence from Tilsit on. In the spring of 1812, when Napoleon vociferously denied that his Eastern mobilization was intended to prepare for war, Caulaincourt coolly answered that he was mobilizing his army to use it, either for a political purpose or "to satisfy his dearest passion". "What is this passion?" asked the emperor laughingly. The answer exhibited the Caulaincourt frankness: "War, Sire". On which Napoleon of course pulled his ear, protesting feebly that it was not true.

Volume II. furnishes a fine description of the horrors of the retreat from Moscow, besides containing certain artless touches such as the emperor's entrance into Liadouï, sliding down an ice-covered hill on the seat of his

breeches like the rest of the army. Caulaincourt's judgment on the whole plan of the Russian campaign is devastating: the lack of discipline, the cross-purposes in high places, the abominably inadequate reconnaissance service, the horses which were never roughshod for a Russian winter, the emperor's own psychological unpreparedness for defensive warfare—all these factors pulverize even further the alibi of an early winter contained in the famous 29th Bulletin. But the finest portion of either volume is comprised in the endless conversations between Napoleon and Caulaincourt when, traveling night and day by sled or carriage from Smorgoni to Paris, the two men talked alone of the disastrous campaign, of the European question, of everything. Those conversations, which occupied the days and nights of December 5th–18th, were noted at the time by Caulaincourt and are here related, always interestingly, sometimes with brilliant penetration.

While the picture of Napoleon that emerges from Caulaincourt's direct and lively narrative exhibits no feature not already familiar, those features are brought out in sharp relief by the foil of Caulaincourt's character. The restless ambition, the eagerness to blame others for catastrophe, the feminine capacity for cajolery, and, above all, the impatience with subordinates for not accomplishing what could not be accomplished, have nowhere been more clearly exhibited. Just as Napoleon urged his brothers to win the affections of the peoples over whom he set them as kings, while his financial and military exactions made it impossible for them to retain those affections when won, so here he eagerly utilizes Caulaincourt's frank honesty and rages when that same honesty stands in his way. It is a fine drama of character; it contains memorable scenes; and it is an indispensable document for the student of Napoleonic history from Erfurt to Moscow.

The University of Virginia. STRINGFELLOW BARR.

The Cambridge History of the British Empire. Volume V., *The Indian Empire, 1858–1918.* [Volume VI., *The Cambridge History of India.*] Edited by H. H. Dodwell, M.A., Professor of the History and Culture of the British Dominions in Asia, in the University of London. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. xxiv, 660. $7.00.)

The Dalhousie-Phayre Correspondence, 1852–1856. Edited with Introduction and Notes by D. G. E. HALL, Professor of History in the University of Rangoon. (Oxford: University Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1932. Pp. lxxii, 426. $8.50.)

VOLUME VI. of the *Cambridge History of India* carries the story of the British in India from 1858 down to 1918, with nine preliminary chapters on the administration between 1818 and 1858, and one on the Mutiny. The whole volume is densely packed with what is called a "sober and accurate"

mass of historical material, compelling the student to pause once again, if he has not done so many times already, before venturing on any easy or sweeping judgments.

It is perhaps a common tendency to think of the India Act of 1858 "for the better government of India" as ushering in an entirely new epoch in the rule of that giant peninsula and one which established, in place of an effete company administration, the centralized, energetic guardianship of a British secretary of state assisted by "a council composed of statesmen experienced in Indian affairs". It is made clear in this volume, however, that even if centralization was advanced and responsibility widened in the latter period, the actual work done under the company was almost continuously marked by a brilliant liberalism that aimed remorselessly at giving, as Lord Macaulay said, "a good government to a people to whom we cannot give a free government". It was during the earlier half century that the district administration in Bengal rooted out the terrors of thagi and dacoity, when human sacrifice, female infanticide, slavery, and sati were gradually eliminated, and when Macaulay's fateful minute launched the now uncontrollable forces of Western education upon India.

The administrations of men like Minto, Dalhousie, and John Lawrence carried out nothing less than a revolution in Indian life and a revolution based on principles that were adhered to under the crown. Government was maintained by and as an alien power: it was not loved, "it is too good for that", as Sir John Strachey said, and "there was no real loyalty" except in rare instances.

Nevertheless the India Act did mark a new chapter and the Mutiny is the turning point, here handled by Dr. T. Rice Holmes in by far the longest chapter in the book. Into six pages he packs a very adequate summary of the course of that outbreak, but he keeps up an old and misleading tradition when he devotes some twenty more pages to the military details of the Mutiny. The proportions as well as the contents of this chapter quite fail, it seems to us, to present the vital significance of the revolt. For example, the importance of the Mussulmans—whom some now even go so far as to think were the backbone of the Mutiny—is hardly given close enough examination, and it is worth noting that the editor, Professor Dodwell, concludes in his introduction that "in ultimate analysis that movement was a Brahman reaction", and does not mention the Mussulmans at all. And while the barbarous measures of General Neill (whose statue in Madras is still guarded by troops) to impress the natives are given in detail, it would have been interesting too to have some figures on the massacres in Delhi and in the countryside perpetrated during those months.

In short the pages devoted to the familiar stories of Cawnpore and Lucknow, of Havelock and Outram, would have been more profitably spent on the psychological facts embedded in the military movements of 1857 and

1858. "The new Indian Empire was founded", it has been said, "with its principal servants in a bitter mood", and this bitterness, rooted in the Mutiny, had its counterpart in a growing number of Indians. It is against this background, in fact, that the studies of Government, Famine Policy, Education, and Law Reform should be read, if we are not to be surprised when we come to the storms and passions of the Nationalist Movement described by Sir Richard Burn and Sir Verney Lovett.

It would be ungrateful to charge too many omissions against a work that contains so much. It is a very thorough and reliable record of the British blue book history of India, written with the insight that one often finds in blue books, and by a group of scholars who feel justifiably proud of a monument to English administrative genius. But it is overloaded on the official side, is innocent of adequate economic chapters, and neglects somewhat the Indian side of the medal. The convulsion of the union of two powerful cultures is lost in the un-Indian coolness of the administrative view. Nevertheless here is an indispensable work of reference for any study of modern India and in its well selected bibliography one will find all that is necessary to correct the balance.

The *Dalhousie-Phayre Correspondence* mainly between Lord Dalhousie, governor-general of India, and Captain Arthur Phayre, first British commissioner of Pegu, is a model piece of work of the kind, with an illuminating introduction, excellent annotation to the letters, a good index, and H. Yule's interesting map of 1857 in the pocket. Read in conjunction with G. E. Harvey's chapter, XXIV., in the Cambridge History, these letters give life and reality to the British conquest of Burma, and more particularly reveal the extraordinary qualities of Lord Dalhousie as a statesman and as a human being. Efficiency and order were his administrative gods—"Peace externally I hope for; but submission and order I must have, and at whatever cost", he writes. And with his "propensity for curiosities", and his genuine affections, he constantly betrays an ordinary humanity that must half explain his power for attracting and using the best in his large band of able subordinates.

McGill University. T. W. L. MacDermot.

Les institutions militaires de la France, 1814–1932: De la paix armée à la paix désarmée. Par J. Monteilhet. (Paris: Felix Alcan. 1932. Pp. xxiv, 472. 35 fr.)

This is an interesting and original book, and opens up an unfamiliar field. Properly speaking it is a special thesis: an indictment of the professional army in any form, and a plea for the *nation armée* pure and simple—a civilian militia without a professional *cadre*. The general student of history nevertheless will find it a most useful contribution, for the author has built up his argument on a historical survey of the actual principles underlying the de-

velopment of the French army since 1814. They are curiously in contrast to the externals of the military apparatus during this long period: as is so often the case, a glance behind the scenes rather shatters the imposing façade of the armies of the nineteenth century type.

After 1815 the Bourbon régime refashioned the army as a guarantee of internal political security, intent upon a reliable *armée de gouvernement* rather than an effective instrument for war. With this in view the country at large was excluded from military service; conscription was applied only to the poorer classes of the population; the soldier was held for a long period of service and encouraged to reënlist; and every effort was made to keep the army a professional caste quite distinct (and as far as possible aloof) from the rest of the country. The whole direction of policy was the opposite of that inaugurated in Prussia in 1814: the reserves were neglected; and all effort was centered on making the army not a training school but a permanent *armée de métier*. Every régime up to 1870 followed in this same path. Napoleon III. realized clearly its inherent military weakness and strove to bring about a change, but could make no headway against the determined opposition to universal service.

M. Monteilhet brings out how far this same tradition (consciously or unconsciously) shaped the course of French military policy even with the adoption of the Prussian system after 1871. Thiers resolutely opposed the change, and largely defeated it in effect by imposing the five-year period of service which remained in force until 1889. Even thereafter the active army was always the first consideration: the reserves, the essential feature of the new system, were neglected until the last phase before 1914. The three-year service law was in large part a last minute remedy for the mistaken policy of the past forty years.

A strongly partisan note mars the author's discussion of this latter period, and his comment on the war falls into conventional iconoclasm. A good deal of ideology enters into the book as a whole; and skillful dialectic does not make up for the absence of proper figures of army strengths and expenditure. But even the more partisan views are set forth with earnestness and sincerity; and his rather antimilitarist study of a practical military problem has an unorthodox quality which is in every way refreshing and valuable. It is a new approach to the subject, and will revise in more ways than one commonly accepted views in regard to the race of armaments between 1870 and 1914.

Cambridge. T. H. Thomas.

The Introduction of the Ironclad Warship. By James Phinney Baxter, 3rd, Associate Professor of History in Harvard University. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1933. Pp. x, 398. $5.00.)

The reviewer has little but praise for this excellent volume, which is

written in a clear, plain style befitting its contents. It is the scholarly product of a long investigation that began in 1923 and embraced a study of the naval archives of the United States, Great Britain, and France and of several important unofficial collections. The extensive manuscript and printed sources used by the author are listed in a bibliography of some eighteen pages. This together with a detailed documentation makes an impressive showing. The work is definitive and will never need to be done again.

Primarily of interest to students of naval history and architecture, it is also of interest to students of general and diplomatic history. In the introductory part the author makes a running start by beginning with the third century B. C. and a ship of Hieron, king of Syracuse, which was plated with lead. His story gathers momentum in the first half of the nineteenth century when no less than five great naval revolutions were under way—steam, shell guns, the screw propeller, rifled ordnance, and armor. It was the shell gun that upset the balance between offense and defense and sounded the knell of the unarmored wooden ship. The French were the leaders. Paixhans invented the shell gun, Dupuy de Lôme designed the first seagoing ironclad, and Napoleon III. backed Dupuy. These three were the chief figures in the introduction of the ironclad. The Crimean War tested the new inventions and gave a decisive verdict in favor of shell fire and armor. At the outbreak of the Civil War the United States had not a single completed ironclad. Dr. Baxter explodes the legend that the Navy Department had no ironclad policy prior to the fight between the *Monitor* and *Merrimac* in Hampton Roads in March, 1862. The Federal government had previously received more than a hundred proposals for ironclads. The author also gives a quietus to the popular belief that the combat in Hampton Roads led to a revolution in the naval architecture of the European powers. Of course this belief has not been recently held by well-instructed historians—see for instance the writings of Rhodes and Maclay. The impetus given to the revolving armored turret and the other consequences of the fight form the subject of a highly informative chapter.

The parts of the volume that treat of the effect of the new naval inventions upon foreign policies and diplomatic relations in the late fifties and early sixties are especially valuable. Students of naval architecture however will find more to their taste the appendixes, which include materials relating to the introduction of the screw propeller and the ram, a project of Napoleon III. for armoring ships, reports of Dupuy de Lôme of April 16, 1858, and September 23, 1860, a plan of the Navy Department of 1861, and Ericsson's proposal of December 23, 1861. The volume is well indexed. *Fulton* and *Fulton the Second* are the same vessel.

Division of Historical Research,
Carnegie Institution of Washington.

CHARLES O. PAULLIN.

Lord Cromer, being the Authorized Life of Evelyn Baring, First Earl of Cromer, G.C.B., O.M., G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I. By the Marquis of ZETLAND. (London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1932. Pp. 366. 25*s*.)

THE story of Cromer's struggles to remake a bankrupt country and also deal with the international complications that resulted from the Egyptian venture is told simply and directly. Frequent quotations from Baring's letters and his written works are used. To be sure this "authorized" life does not seriously doubt the correctness of any of the decisions or plans of the subject under treatment. Zetland accepts everything that Cromer did or said without any serious attempt to penetrate behind the word or deed. For example, he gives Cromer's own justification for the final appointment of Gordon, "I gave a reluctant assent, in reality against my own judgment and inclination, because I thought that as everybody differed from me, I must be wrong" (p. 110).

When treating the international complications that resulted from the Egyptian occupation the noble author leaves his firmer ground of source-reference and ventures into some interesting examples of "authorized" writing. The reason for Cromer's position and part in the *rapprochement* with France after 1903 is interesting as well as novel. Between the chapter dealing with the unfortunate Fashoda incident and the chapter that explains the subsequent liquidation of the rival claims, one finds a short interlude entitled, The German Menace. The purpose of this insert of seven pages seems to be to give an ethical basis for the attitude of Cromer after 1903. This 1903–1904 pro-French attitude, we are to believe from Zetland's account, was the result of the full realization on the part of Baring that the German nation was infected with the poison of "that false code of civilization termed German *Kultur*" (p. 266). And therefore the correct and ethical solution of the international complications and of the admitted French obstructionists' activities in Egypt was to come to some terms with the French. The author's only source of information to support this acquired ethical defense for the Anglo-French accord is seemingly a review article, The German Historians, published for the first time in the *Spectator*, August 28, 1915. To be sure, as an additional support for Cromer's ethics in 1904, Zetland does refer the reader to an earlier chapter in which Cromer is made to prophesy correctly the outcome of the Franco-Prussian war. The second paragraph of the subsequent chapter, the section of the book that deals with the accord of 1904, has the following to say about the financier-statesman's attitude:

> [Cromer] assessed values instinctively; in any situation in which they existed he detected unerringly the elements of a bargain. So here. "In Morocco, Siam, and Sokoto", Cromer wrote, "the French want various things which we have it in our power to give. In Newfoundland and Egypt the situation is reversed. In these latter cases we depend to a greater extent on the good will of France" (p. 271).

In fairness to the "instinctive" sense of values of Baring it would seem a bit better to admit that the Englishman simply saw imperial realities as they were—that he had something to give, Morocco, Siam, and Sokoto, in exchange for something he wanted, Egypt and Newfoundland. To drag in an article written in 1915 to prove that this bargain had some ethical background or inception is, to put it mildly, naïve and to put it bluntly a *non sequitur*.

The impression left by reading this book is that one has finished the story of a great man of a past age, the last representative, as it were of the righteous paternalistic imperialism of the nineteenth century. Cromer was a "good" man by every standard generally accepted of that day, but that day is over though one would never be aware of that fact from this book.

The University of Colorado. ERWIN F. MEYER.

Documents diplomatiques français, 1871–1914. Série 2 (1901–1911), tome IV., 5 *Octobre 1903–8 Avril 1904.* Série 3 (1911–1914), tome V., 5 *Décembre 1912–14 Mars 1913.* [Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Commission de publication des Documents relatifs aux origines de la guerre de 1914.] (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. 1932; 1933. Pp. xxxvii, 565; xxxviii, 730. 60 fr. each.)

Two main threads run through the volume for the winter of 1903–1904: the rapid negotiations for the Anglo-French Convention, and the on-coming Russo-Japanese War. The first thread has already been pretty clearly untangled by the *British Documents*. On the Russo-Japanese question, however, there is more light on the confusion and the two opposite currents at St. Petersburg: the foreign minister, Muraviev, excluded from control over Far Eastern affairs, asserting optimistically that there would be no war; and Alexeiev and the militarists driving forward toward what they thought would be an easy victory over the Japanese.

On Christmas Eve, 1903, the British ambassador at Rome told Victor Emmanuel that he considered war in Manchuria inevitable, and this conviction gradually spread outside of Russia during the next six weeks. The French of course sympathized with their Russian ally; so also did the German and Italian governments, partly from sentiments of monarchical solidarity; but the German and Italian common people, as well as the Anglo-Saxons, openly sympathized with the Japanese, partly as a result of Russia's autocratic oppression at home as well as of the Jewish press everywhere which had not forgotten the Russian *pogroms*. The war left the British unhampered in pushing the Younghusband Expedition into Tibet and in strengthening their grip on the Persian Gulf—facts which caused the Pan-Slav press to pour out its vials of impotent wrath. The war also helped to wreck the Mürzsteg program of reform in Macedonia, since Turkey realized, in spite of Russia's

assertions, that Russia, bound hand-and-foot in the Far East, was powerless to force the observance of reforms in the Near East.

Other interesting matters are France's solicitude for her predominant position as representative of Roman Catholics in China and Turkey; Delcassé's refusal, contrary to the wishes of Rouvier and French bankers, to sanction the participation of French capital in the Bagdad Railway; a French convention with Siam; discussion about the neutralization of Denmark and anxiety about that of Belgium; delightful comments of M. Jusserand upon Theodore Roosevelt; and Barrère's zeal in trying to draw Italy completely away from the Triple Alliance and into the French orbit by a "Mediterranean Triple Alliance" of England, France, and Italy.

The volume for the first part of the armistice period of the First Balkan War—730 pages for ninety-eight days—details at length the efforts of the London Conference of Ambassadors. Here the six great powers sought to find a satisfactory boundary and government for Albania, territorial compensations for Roumania, a viable disposition of the Ægean Islands coveted by Greece, Italy, and Turkey, and, above all, the prevention of a European war through placing the Concert of Europe above the selfish interests of both the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente. For the most part these efforts were successful. This success was owing in part no doubt to the adoption of Sir Edward Grey's wise suggestion at the first meeting of the ambassadors that the sessions should be absolutely confidential, and that no communications should be made to the press or to any individual concerning their work (p. 94). Consequently M. Paul Cambon headed all his reports on the London Conference, "Absolutely secret", and there were no serious "leaks".

In the process of tightening the Triple Entente one notes negotiations for an Anglo-French naval accord relating to waters in the Far East whose "principal object is the destruction of the German fleet" at Kiao-chau (p. 387), and also for a naval accord in regard to Mediterranean waters which was to be arranged by a very secret incognito visit of Prince Henry of Battenberg to Paris (p. 483 ff.). There is again evidence of French anxiety at Sazonov's habit of acting rashly without first consulting his French ally (pp. 138, 143, 152, 351, 374 ff., 392), and of French irritation at his lack of frankness in concealing so long the Russo-Bulgarian military convention of 1902 (pp. 368, 371, 390 ff., 408, 512). Possibly this may have been a slight additional factor in the replacement of M. Georges Louis by M. Delcassé as French ambassador at St. Petersburg.

Among the other most interesting topics in these documents are the long-drawn-out negotiations for a consortium loan to China, the reports concerning the new laws for the increase of the Belgian and German armies, and French anxiety about Belgian neutrality.

Harvard University. SIDNEY B. FAY.

Fall of the German Empire, 1914–1918. Selected and Edited by RALPH HASWELL LUTZ, Professor of History, Stanford University. Translations by David G. Rempel and Gertrude Rendtorff. [Documents of the German Revolution, volumes I. and II.] (Stanford University: Stanford University Press. 1932. Pp. xxiii, 868; xiv, 593. $12.00.)

THESE two volumes are intended to be the first of a series of publications on the reorganization of Germany since 1914. Based upon the rich resources of the Hoover War Library, they present a large collection of source material covering the years from the outbreak of the war to the revolution of November, 1918. The aim of the work is to "enable students . . . to go beyond secondary authorities with respect to a number of objectively presented war problems, in general to penetrate behind the ordinary narrative of German history, and thus to vitalize their study by immediate contact with primary sources".

Two questions arise quite naturally in any consideration of an enterprise of this sort: what is the nature of the material presented, and to what extent does it meet the purpose for which it was designed? The first question is one most difficult to answer. It stands to reason that the source material for the history of any country during four years of the World War is practically endless, especially when unofficial material is taken into consideration. Now there are five hundred odd documents in these two volumes. These papers are of the greatest variety: official dispatches, notes, proclamations, etc.; extracts from newspapers, letters, memoirs and similar material; unpublished documents from the Hoover Library, like the selections from the Herron and Kanner papers, military orders and miscellaneous source matter. These papers deal with almost every important aspect of German history during the war, such as diplomacy, domestic history (socialism, electoral reform, etc.), censorship, propaganda, war aims, the food problem, strikes, the Polish question, and so on. Under the circumstances the number of documents devoted to each subject is necessarily small. It is bound to be a rigid selection, and should therefore take into account only the key documents.

On the whole the editor has done a very careful and conscientious piece of work. Whether all crucial material has been included it would be impossible to say without reëxamining all the papers he has had at his disposal. What can be said is that the material here included is almost without exception material of importance and interest. It all has, to say the least, considerable illustrative value. Some of the Kanner papers might have been omitted without serious harm, but taken in the large there is little to quarrel with on the score of selection, and every reader will understand that much latitude must be left to an editor confronted by the questions of inclusion and exclusion. The translations, too, are well done; here and there a little bit clumsy and a little too literal, but generally faithful and accurate.

The scholar would probably have been more pleased if the attempt had been made to publish more extensively the unknown materials in the War Library, if the complete materials on special subjects had been made available. But this collection is avowedly designed for the student in the narrower sense. For him it will no doubt be convenient to have even easily accessible material included in one general collection. One may raise the question, however, what students are apt to use this work? Graduate students will not find enough material on any one subject to meet the needs of monographic work. For undergraduates, on the other hand, the collection is too extensive, the more so in view of the fact that German history is dealt with in detail in only a few institutions. If the present work serves to stimulate the further study of German history (especially domestic history) in this country it will have served a sound purpose in expanding historical work. But to the present reviewer it seems that the collection, admirable as it is, rather shoots between two marks. It can be useful to the scholar in only a limited sense. He will want the unpublished material, and will regret that so much space has been devoted to the text of Reichstag debates, periodical and newspaper extracts, and documents elsewhere available. The college student, on the other hand, will find himself embarrassed by the wealth and variety of the material. It is unlikely that he will find the time necessary to go through two heavy volumes on the war period of German history alone.

Harvard University. WILLIAM L. LANGER.

European Diplomatic History, 1871–1932. By RAYMOND JAMES SONTAG, Associate Professor of History, Princeton University. [Century Historical Series.] (New York: Century Company. 1933. Pp. xi, 425. $3.50.)

STUDENTS of diplomatic history, for years overwhelmed by the flood of documents and memoirs relating to the pre-war years, have tended to write learned articles and long books for each other's benefit and to neglect the beginner. Mr. Sontag has therefore performed a real service in preparing a textbook which will make available the results of recent investigations to college students. Though he modestly disclaims "exhaustive research" for the whole field, he is quite obviously at home in the *Grosse Politik* and similar collections, and occasional sentences indicate that he is keenly aware of the points over which controversy still rages. He has also demonstrated that a textbook can be written in attractive and interesting style; without being in the least lurid, he portrays the diplomatists as human beings rather than automatons, and without appeal to sentimentality he makes the conflicts of national interests clear-cut and intelligible. On only one point did the reviewer, who read the book with much pleasure, have a doubt. Approaching the subject from a philosophical rather than a factual point of view,

Mr. Sontag is more concerned to show why things happened—which he does extremely well—than to narrate in detail what happened. Thus the casual references to the Bagdad Railway do not show what that enterprise involved; the provisions of the Treaty of Björkö are too summarily stated; the Anglo-German agreements of the spring of 1914 are dismissed in one sentence, although they were apparently responsible for the German hypothesis in July that England would remain neutral in a European war. In other words, a little more concreteness, something that students can "put their teeth into", seems desirable. In a sense Mr. Sontag evidently realizes this, for he provides a very neat tabulation of events from July 24 to August 4, 1914. The best section of the book is the long analysis of Anglo-German relations: a vivid and impartial analysis of the reasons why each country deeply suspected the other and of the insuperable obstacles to an understanding.

The forty-two pages on the war should be particularly useful, for little has been written on the diplomatic episodes of the struggle. Mr. Sontag seems to have overlooked the point that, if Bernstorff is to be believed, Wilson was preparing, at the end of January, 1917, to intervene in the interests of peace, as Germany desired, when the unrestricted submarine warfare was announced. Nor is there any account of the Allied intervention in Russia. The chapter on the Peace Conference is excellent, being written in the spirit of the emotions prevailing at the time and concluding with an unemotional critique of the treaties. In the two concluding chapters Mr. Sontag, abandoning narrative, analyzes the troubles of post-war Europe, and skillfully presents the diplomatic connotations of economic misery and inflamed nationalism. Americans who are unable to understand why Europe has not appreciated American policy since the war will find these pages illuminating and distressing. Mr. Sontag set out to study the "riddle" that has confronted statesmen for two generations: "How can desirable changes in the international *status quo* be effected, and undesirable changes prevented, without recourse to war?" In 1914, after forty years of diplomatic sparring, the search for a solution was "abandoned as hopeless". To-day, as in 1871, the riddle is still "unanswered". The interest of his book lies precisely in the circumstance that no other verdict seemed possible in the "black night" of 1932, but as is proper for a historian, he reminds us that "any conclusions reached to-day may be invalidated to-morrow", and deprecates a "despairing *non possumus*".

The University of Chicago. BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

The Odyssey of Cabeza de Vaca. By MORRIS BISHOP. (New York: Century Company. 1933. Pp. vii, 306. $3.00.)

DIVIDED into two parts, this artistic volume treats of the ventures of Cabeza de Vaca into the northern and southern borderlands of the Spanish New World Empire. In Part I.—which comprises nearly three-fifths of the

total—after sketching the little that is known of Vaca's family background and youth, the author follows his subject on his four months' journey through Florida with the Narváez expedition, on the hectic gulf journey from Florida to Bad Luck Island, in his harrowing experiences of several years duration among the Indian tribes that inhabited the coast region of Texas, and finally on the "great journey" (one of the greatest of its kind in history) from South Texas to the Gulf of Lower California.

The account of the wanderings from Florida to the Pacific adds little to the scholarly work of Buckingham Smith and others. Indeed, the little that is added frequently has a far-fetched and doubtful basis. For example, it may be doubted whether the Florida insects that attacked by relays Vaca and his companions in 1528 were like those graphically described by William Bartram in 1774, two hundred and forty-six years later. Again, it may be questioned whether De León's description of the Indians inhabiting northern Mexico would accurately characterize the tribes encountered by Vaca at a much earlier period. In defense of the author it may be said that he always lets his reader know when he is going on excursions into the byways.

Part II. deals with these topics: Vaca's three years (1537–1540) sojourn in Spain; his commission as *adelantado* and governor of the Río de la Plata; the sea journey to Santa Catalina Island and the arduous land journey across present day southern Brazil to Asunción on the Paraguay; Vaca's attempted reforms and the rise of opposition to them; the futile attempt to establish an overland route to Peru; the conspiracy against the governor and his captivity in Asunción; and "the end in Spain".

Like the first, the second part of the work is based primarily on contemporary writings and on the older histories. Unlike the first, the material in the second division is largely new to students of United States history. For this reason, and for the additional one that Vaca's experiences in Florida and Texas on the one hand and in South America on the other typify a sort of hemisphere unity during the colonial epoch, the book should be widely read.

As indicated by the title (Odyssey), the author has attempted to set forth his story in popular form. For the most part he has succeeded. In a few places clarity and precision almost succumb to attempts to be literary, as for example when the author speaks of his hero's retreat after his failure to reach Peru by way of the Chaco. "Sick in body, with despair in his heart, he made the journey down a river of delirium" (p. 248). At times the author may become a bit too enthusiastic in defending his subject, as in the controversy between Vaca and Irala. The author does not always subject his evidence to an analysis critical enough for the historian.

Despite typographical errors on pages 156 and 227 and a few errors in the use of the accent, the format of the book is excellent. Eight illustrations, three maps, a bibliography, and an index enhance the value of the volume.

The Ohio State University. LAWRENCE F. HILL.

Washington. By FIRMIN ROZ. [Collection "Les Constructeurs".] (Paris: Dunod. 1933. Pp. 282. 40 fr.)

OUTGROWTH of a course of lectures at the Sorbonne in 1917–1918, the present work gives little indication of the War psychology. It is serious interpretation, not propaganda, and is so admirably proportioned that although it is not a detailed biography, it serves the general reader adequately.

The Jumonville incident, together with the Jay Treaty and Monroe Mission at either end of Washington's career severely test a Frenchman's objectivity. Roz does not accept the view still held by many of his countrymen that in the former Washington was treacherous (p. 58). While in discussing the Jay Treaty, he ignores for the most part French reaction. On the equally touchy subject of the X Y Z Affair, he is even more condensed (p. 253).

The author is not backward in claiming full credit for French participation in the American Revolution and French share in final victory. He shows, moreover, true Gallic animus against Steuben—Lafayette himself could not be harsher—maintaining that his rôle has been exaggerated by German propaganda, and that in reality he was no more than a well-paid mercenary in the service of a foreign country (p. 158). On the other hand, he offers no defense for Citizen Genêt (pp. 228–230), meeting thus the test of objectivity and the scientific spirit. A spirit once more tested by the events of 1797–1798. Here again Roz finds in Washington no animosity towards France as such, but merely a desire to aggrandize America (p. 265).

As between the two great aids of Washington, Hamilton and Jefferson, the author favors the former as "one of the greatest statesmen that America has ever known" (p. 222). Moreover, he defends Washington's support of a "capitalistic" economy. Nationalism, not capitalism, was the kernel of his thinking, the latter being strictly subordinate to the former (p. 223).

When Roz asserts that Washington was not a moralist but rather a Virginia aristocrat attached to the interests of his class, he is only partly true (p. 195). The material interest was present, perhaps even dominant, but a writer has not known Washington who has not divined his philosophic outlook. The statement that "il n'est qu'un homme d'action, un esprit positif, l'homme des faits" (p. 275) misses Washington by many miles. Again, a closer study of Washington's reaction to the French Revolution (p. 227) might reveal a deeper sympathy than Roz apparently discovers. But these are scattered observations in what is mainly a most judicious estimate.

Typographical errors are few and unimportant. Dabury Carr (p. 109) should be Dabney Carr. And "peau d'ours" (p. 41) becomes perhaps intentionally amusing when promptly translated "thread bear".

Washington will find its readers chiefly among the author's fellow-countrymen. One rejoices that they are offered here so wise and so depend-

able, so generous and understanding an epitome of the career and character of the first American.

Purdue University. LOUIS MARTIN SEARS.

New York in the Critical Period, 1783–1789. By E. WILDER SPAULDING, Department of State, Washington, D. C. [New York State Historical Association Series, DIXON RYAN FOX, Editor.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1932. Pp. xiii, 334. $4.50.)

New York in the Confederation: an Economic Study. By THOMAS C. COCHRAN, Department of History, New York University. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1932. Pp. ix, 220. $2.50.)

Expansion in New York, with Especial Reference to the Eighteenth Century. By RUTH L. HIGGINS, Ph.D., Professor of History, Woman's College of Alabama. (Columbus: Ohio State University. 1931. Pp. xi, 209.)

THESE three studies throw further light upon New York in the later eighteenth century, a subject which has received marked attention from historians in recent years. Spaulding presents a thorough analysis of internal conditions in the state between 1783 and 1788; Cochran discusses the relations between the state and central governments from 1775 to 1788; and Miss Higgins gives a detailed account of the spread of the state frontier, chiefly in the eighteenth century. The books are based upon doctoral dissertations at Harvard, Pennsylvania, and Ohio State, respectively.

The Spaulding volume is the first of the New York State Historical Association Series and it comes up to the high quality which one expects in anything edited by Dixon Ryan Fox. The author, who is assistant to the historical adviser of the Department of State, has done a thorough piece of work, utilizing a wide range of material. The arrangement is well balanced and the book is readable. Its central theme is the "struggle of a propertied, intelligent minority to maintain itself against a less well-to-do, less sophisticated majority". Alexander Hamilton, leader of the Federalist merchants, lawyers, and great landowners, is already a familiar character; the author helps to remove from partial oblivion Hamilton's antagonist, Governor George Clinton, whose chief following was among the up-state yeomen and tenants. As a background for the political struggle of the "Embattled Statesmen at Poughkeepsie", Spaulding presents an able analysis of the land situation, with its holdovers from the old English manorial system, and discusses business conditions with particular reference to the commerce of New York's great seaport. He points out that the post-war depression was at its worst in 1786 and that "the crisis had been passed, even before the Philadelphia Convention met". He devotes much attention to the composition of the two

parties in the state, a cleavage which, as his maps demonstrate, remained fairly constant from Clinton's victory over Schuyler in 1777 to the debates on the Federal Constitution in 1788. No single formula, he states, will adequately explain those party divisions. It was a contest of north against south, country against city, farmer against merchant, and has also been called a struggle of debtor against creditor, democrat against plutocrat, stolidity against intelligence, and non-Episcopalian against Episcopalian. The presence of the great landowners in the Federalist camp is the cause for much comment. While Cochran contends that they were allied with the city merchants because they were holders of government securities, Spaulding lays emphasis on the fact that they had no fear of the land taxes involved in a Federal impost since "the landlord had carefully written into most of the leases a provision making the tenant responsible for future taxes". In this he takes issue with O. G. Libby, who held otherwise in his *Geographical Distribution of the Vote of the Thirteen States on the Federal Constitution* (p. 20).. Spaulding shows how the Clintonian party supported paper money and killed the Federal impost and, in his extremely interesting closing chapters, shows how they went into the Poughkeepsie Convention in 1788 expecting to defeat the ratification of the Constitution, until the ratification by New Hampshire and Virginia led New York to fear reprisals if she remained outside. The author has so mastered details that he is able to re-create the whole picture in vivid form, and he has also added a very useful bibliography.

Mr. Cochran's work would have inspired no enthusiasm at any time, but its effect is further diminished by the simultaneous appearance of Mr. Spaulding's book which overlaps its field sufficiently to show the possibilities which Mr. Cochran neglected. It is open to criticism all the way from title to index and its shortcomings in argument and accuracy are not redeemed by any charm of style. Its title would have better indicated the contents had it been called "New York and the Continental Congress", for one thinks of the Confederation as not starting until 1781. The author has conveniently summed up his conclusions on page 181. They are interesting, but some of them do not seem to have been adequately supported in the body of the book. His most important argument is that the weakness of the Confederation government was due primarily not to its own faulty machinery, nor even to the state legislatures, but to the unwillingness of the people to pay taxes. With an impressive array of figures, which one hopes are more accurate than his bibliography and index, he argues that New York paid a very respectable share of its quota considering its severe handicaps during the Revolution. At times, he digresses into general remarks about the Continental Congress which have little apparent relation to New York State, and there is marked lack of unity in his various sections dealing with Indian relations, cession of Western lands, the Vermont boundary dispute, and the like. Although he calls the work primarily an economic study, his treatment of the impost ques-

tion cannot bear comparison with Spaulding's discussion of this, the latter emphasizing the heavy toll which New York port collected as *entrepôt* for much of the trade of New Jersey and Connecticut. The reviewer has analyzed the commercial manuscripts which Cochran cites and reached a much less optimistic conclusion about the burden of debts which hung over the New York merchants. The book reveals scores of instances of inexcusable carelessness, which is all the more surprising when one recalls the meticulous care with which manuscripts are edited by university presses. Having noted twenty errors of fact or form in twenty minutes, one must warn the reader to check carefully all facts, figures, or bibliographical citations which he may wish to incorporate into his own work. There is a wealth of statistical material in the text and appendixes, but even a glance at Appendix E shows that the first "1787" should be "1784", and that naturally shakes confidence in the rest. The footnote citations show a range much narrower than the long, uncritical bibliography with its unique chronological arrangement, and one questions the author's familiarity with the books he lists when one finds on page 202 a citation of "Scoville, J. A., *The Old Merchants of New York City*" and on page 206, "Barrett, Walter, *The Old Merchants of New York City*", considering that the books are identical, Scoville writing under the pseudonym of Barrett. It does not require a British critic to notice that something is wrong with the citation of an article on *"Sir Johnson, Loyalist"* (p. 209), which is also, incidentally, one of the frequent examples of lack of uniformity in italicizing. The treacherous index is incomplete and inaccurate, which is worse than no index at all. It refers, for instance, to "Banker, Gerard", citing page 46. There is nothing on that page, but on page 45, we find the name spelled properly, "Bancker". Of six names mentioned on page 103, only one appears in the index which also excludes Sir William Johnson and his sons, although they figure in both text and bibliography.

Miss Higgins has produced a more satisfactory work, based on her purpose "to trace the advance of settlement in New York and to present the attendant policies of the colony and state concerning land, Indian, and fur trade problems of the frontier". She carries the story from the settlement of Schenectady in 1661 to 1825 when "the frontier stage had passed, for all of the territory in New York State had come into private or public possession of the white man, and expansion of settlement had reached the boundary limits". Official records and local histories have been drawn upon heavily in the preparation of this valuable guide to the multitudinous details of a very intricate situation. In spite of the great mass of factual matter, so laboriously and usefully straightened out, Miss Higgins has been able to make the book readable, giving intimate pictures of the various stages of the development. She points out in particular the circumstances leading to the great grants of frontier land, and discusses their retarding influence upon the growth of the

frontier, for settlers went to other colonies where there was better opportunity to secure land of their own. One is interested to note the frequent instances of matings between whites and Indians and the effect which they had in extending the frontier. The actual situation of the frontier in the Revolution seems to deserve somewhat fuller treatment. The study, nevertheless, is a valuable contribution to the history of the New York frontier, and should serve as an extremely useful guide.

Princeton University. ROBERT G. ALBION.

John Sevier, Pioneer of the Old Southwest. By CARL S. DRIVER, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in Vanderbilt University. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1932. Pp. viii, 240. $2.50.)

IN Tennessee John Sevier is a hero of the first magnitude, his fame rivaling, if not eclipsing, that of Andrew Jackson. Though his career has attracted the attention of several writers, Professor Driver has produced the first scholarly biography of "Nolachucky Jack". "Few attempts", he states, "have been made to discover if the glamor and romance which surround his name have had a real or an idealized character as their source", and the object of the author is "to contribute something of reality to the estimate of a very real and human person". He believes that the figure of Andrew Jackson has dwarfed that of Sevier in the eyes of history, and he makes an obvious effort to correct the balance in favor of the latter. Much new information has been drawn from Sevier's official papers in the Tennessee State Library, and additional light has been thrown upon several phases of his life. Especially informative is the account of the quarrel between Jackson and Sevier. No available source of information has been neglected, and it is probable that we shall never know much more of the life of Sevier than is here set forth. But despite the author's obvious intention, he has failed to make a hero out of an idealized character. One puts down the book with the impression that Sevier must have been, in spite of his biographer's persistent courage, a great disappointment to him.

Sevier's fame rests upon the Battle of King's Mountain, his reputation as an Indian fighter, and his career as governor of the State of Franklin and of the State of Tennessee. There is little in his record to indicate that he was greatly concerned for the commonweal. His chief aspiration throughout many years was to build up a fortune in lands; and in order to understand his career, it is necessary to understand the land speculations in which he participated. The only serious weakness of the book arises from the author's failure to comprehend adequately the intricacies of North Carolina politics as they affected the public lands. The *résumé* of Jefferson's report (pp. 107–108) is misleading because all the figures appear to relate to Washington County. A long and labored argument concerning Jackson's charges of land frauds against Sevier brings out the fact that Jackson's motives were in-

terested, but fails to clear the name of his rival. The author apparently does not realize that the Supreme Court, in considering the case of Polk's Lessee *v.* Hill, Wendel, *et al.*, was concerned with the rights of innocent purchasers under Sevier's grant, not with the question of frauds committed prior to the grant. These are very different matters. Professor Driver's conclusion is that Sevier's "methods were no better and no worse than those of others . . . during that era". Such arguments are familiar to all students of American history, but they are false. It is unfortunate that in so admirable a study the author should have permitted himself to become an apologist for Sevier. There have always been both honest and dishonest men, and it is better to classify them.

The University of Virginia. THOMAS P. ABERNETHY.

The Exploration of Western America, 1800–1850: an Historical Geography. By E. W. GILBERT, B.Litt., M.A., Formerly Exhibitioner of Hertford College, Oxford; Lecturer in Geography in the University of Reading. (Cambridge: The University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1933. Pp. xiii, 233. $3.25.)

THIS historical geography of Western United States (Professor Bolton would query the author's "America") will be a cherished convenience to the expert and a great boon to student and general reader. It is curious that no American has been satisfied to do just this thing before—give the simple story of the Astorians, Ashleys, Smiths, Pikes, and Frémonts as an unfolding literary cinema of the West, leaving the emigration and political factors for another time or person. Too often, with us, suffering from a kind of *ingénue* complex, the simple, needful thing has not seemed sufficiently scholarly.

The wealth of maps and charts in Mr. Gilbert's useful book, bringing together some thirty from Cary's time to Warren's, will greatly delight the average reader to whom the latter's *Memoir* is unknown, or inaccessible, and make much easier the task of teaching the history of the West.

Early exploration and geographical analysis occupy ninety-one of Mr. Gilbert's pages. Exploration from Lewis and Clark to the finding of the Great Basin fill the remaining 114 pages. A useful bibliography and good index round out the work. The footnoting is not of the wooden type; it is sincere work and makes full use of the bibliography.

The pleasure of having such a book tends to disarm criticism. There is a valuable tang in having this done by an Englishman; for, while he may seem almost unwestern enough to say "I am going up into the mountains to-day" (which is quite as reprehensible as to say in Boston "I am going over to the Harvard campus"), you get an unhackneyed and unbiased treatment of the whole list of adventurers, and catch a refreshing view of this army of explorers advancing here, retreating there, without having the picture too much cloyed with political or personal eccentricities, animadversions and the like. That,

in fact, introduces the chief topic of regret in perusing the book—that the author, with his opportunity of setting and resource, did not do what everyone has neglected, namely, sum up the criticisms of early American explorers voiced in the leading contemporary British reviews—not of their personalities but of their work as scientists; the praise, for example, of Lewis and Clark's feat while bemoaning their failure to make use of their data as scientists.

It is also to be regretted that the author did not wish to conclude his study with 1853–1854 rather than 1850, and show how the great medley of maps at the time was remarkably cleared up by the hundreds of profiles, sketches, and maps made by Jefferson Davis's Pacific Railway surveyors, a fact clearly depicted by comparing anything done before 1854 even with Colton's popular *Atlas of the Union* of 1864. Those productions of Stevens, Whipple, Beckwith, Williamson, *et al.*, mark the real end of the era so splendidly presented by Mr. Gilbert.

While there are minute errors, like perpetuating the idea that Frémont really found Walker's Pass, and while the best of opportunities to show how poorly Lewis and Clark were "guided" at critical points was overlooked, in actual classroom practice the teacher of the history of the West cannot do better than to rank this book with Griffin's *Writings* and the 1905 *Report* of our own Association, for the continuity it presents and for its wealth of graphs, charts, and maps of the 1800–1850 period of exploration.

Colorado College. ARCHER B. HULBERT.

The Monroe Doctrine, 1826–1867. By DEXTER PERKINS, Watson Professor of History, University of Rochester. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1933. Pp. xi, 580. $3.50.)

A distinguished member of the Association of which this *Review* is the organ, after returning from an archæological expedition in South America, wrote (1913) a book on the Monroe Doctrine entitling it an *Obsolete Shibboleth*. Later the World War caused him to change his conception of it, and the startling phrase fell out of use. Professor Perkins, an equally distinguished member of the Association, observes the early evolution of the Monroe Doctrine not as an archæologist returning from travels in a pleasing and sympathetic country, but as a clear-minded student of documents who has already contributed a brilliant and somewhat iconoclastic monograph on the origins of the Monroe Doctrine. He, too, now begins to call it repeatedly a shibboleth, a dogma, but ends by using the phrase "the great diplomatic principle". Shibboleth, dogma, or principle—this reviewer prefers the word principle—it is certainly a sound conception of national interest which has taken deep lodgment in the American mind. So the author says in closing this second volume of a projected four-volume examination of the origin and evolution of the famous dictum of 1823.

This volume, if not so compact, is a worthy successor to the notable pre-

decessor. With prodigious labor and industry the author has attacked and digested a vast array of secondary literature and of printed and unprinted sources, including the principal archival material in the United States and Europe, some of which (the *Maximilianarchiv*) is now available in photostatic form in the Library of Congress. The only noteworthy body of manuscript material which may still yield small points to refine any of Mr. Perkins's conclusions is the archives of the Juarez régime in Mexico, of which a large portion, possibly the essential portion, was available in print.

Despite the amount of material emanating from so many countries, the author is at all times compelling and masterful with details. Facts to him, once established, are useful to form conclusions, and when they mean little, or teach nothing, he dismisses them unless it is necessary to take time to show that they have been misunderstood. The result is a well-written, smoothly-flowing procession of interpretation, a fresh and stimulating review of the meaning of the Monroe Doctrine as it developed during the years 1826–1866, containing pages full of what the newspaperman would call "editorial". A reviewer to be critical must challenge or agree. Any challenge has got to be undertaken with great temerity, because no one has ever been over the ground, and probably no one will ever go over the ground again, as thoroughly as Mr. Perkins. The main argument of the volume is that the history of the Monroe Doctrine to 1866 shows "the growth of a great principle of action, little noted in the thirties, revived in the forties, taking root in the fifties, consolidated and vindicated in the sixties". No one can challenge that. Only in some of the minor interpretations one may be permitted to argue. In describing and analyzing the revival of the Doctrine in Polk's time, after the significant quiescence of the thirties in spite of occasional European aggression in South and Central America, the author mentions four factors: Texas, California, Oregon, and the La Plata region. Now Texas, except for furnishing a text for a provocative speech of Guizot to the French chamber, which might be used conveniently for display to the American people—Texas had nothing to do with Polk's pronouncement of December, 1845, for the simple reason that (as the author says later on, page 120) it was a settled question—it had been annexed to the United States before Polk became President. We think we perceive the author's Texas argument running *diminuendo*. As for the French and British menaces in the La Plata estuary, did they not really serve somewhat to limit Polk's famous pronouncement to the *North* American continent, rather than to expand or even to revive its original purview?

The author thinks Polk's message on the Yucatan incident of 1848 "the beginning of that historical process by which a principle of non-intervention has been transformed into a principle of intervention". This reviewer will be delighted later to see Mr. Perkins deal with Theodore Roosevelt's abuse of the Monroe Doctrine and his mischievous "corollary", which American statesmen have been straining to explain away ever since 1904, but he cannot yet

bring himself to the broad conclusion implied in this quoted passage. While not denying an imperialism which may be called a Panama Policy, we must wait to be converted by subsequent volumes to the idea that American imperialism (Cuba, Panama, the Caribbean, Central America) has been necessarily a part of the Monroe Doctrine. Anyway, we cannot see that the process began with Polk's reaction to Yucatan. The author, although he realizes that invitations may not be what they seem, thinks Polk unjustified in having been ready to construe the Monroe Doctrine, if necessary, to prevent a European power annexing after invitation a province (Yucatan) of an American republic. Was not annexation and intervention so invited by the Dominicans, by the Mexicans, in 1860–1865? At least so the intervening European powers declared.

The diplomatic significance of the Maximilian venture is fully treated. A good case is made against the hitherto accepted view that the withdrawal of French troops was due to the German question. The author attaches much importance to the increasing drain of Mexico on the French treasury and the growing hostility of French public opinion, and he believes that Napoleon would have "cut the painter" if the United States had never said a word; but he shows that the decision was greatly hastened by the rising tone of Seward's warnings and demands following the end of the Civil War in North America.

As already suggested, any critical review must be argumentative on minor matters. We can only admire and applaud the accuracy of the author's scholarship, the breadth and depth of his researches, the relish and resolution and power of his style, and the importance of his contribution to the diplomatic history of the United States.

George Washington University. SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS.

John Quincy Adams, "Old Man Eloquent". By BENNETT CHAMP CLARK. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1932. Pp. 437. $3.75.)

THE writing of the life of a statesman such as John Quincy Adams, whose public career spans many years, presents serious difficulties. The book must become in a sense an abridged history of the times, with especial emphasis on the part taken by one man. In this way one gets a distorted picture, with some events brought out in strong colors, and others, perhaps equally important, barely mentioned.

Mr. Clark handles this problem with considerable skill. His volume gives an outline of American history for a full half-century, interestingly presented, and in the main accurate, through which the figure of Adams passes like the leading actor in a play. Here and there, however, from lack of space or from fear of tiring the reader, he fails to round out the story of this event or that. His recital of Nullification is abruptly broken off without the concluding incidents, while his account of the public lands question seems to have been

pinned on to the end of chapter X. for lack of a better place to put it. Mr. Clark is rather unjust to Great Britain by failing to state her side of the impressment quarrel, and too lenient in his judgment of Burr. In view of the revealing Merry correspondence, it seems a bit strong to say that the accusation that Burr plotted treason is now almost universally discredited.

Mr. Clark gives a vivid and unbiased picture of Adams. Throughout we see the able, incorruptible, patriotic diplomat and statesman; the loving and tender son and husband; but a man who was unrelenting in his hatreds, uncharitable, frigid, ego-centric in his relations with his associates. The estimate of his part in leading events—in the Treaty of Ghent, the Florida Purchase, the Monroe Doctrine, the election of 1824, the slavery petitions—is in the main accurate and just. Whenever he bases his account on Adams's diary, Mr. Clark makes due allowance for the writer's eccentricities.

It is unfortunate that the book ends abruptly with the death of Adams. The reader would have been grateful for a summary of his career, and an estimate of his influence upon American history. He would like to know in what ways Adams shaped the future of American diplomacy, of Latin-American relations, of the slavery struggle, to what extent he is to-day a force in the life of the nation.

The style, despite occasional crudities, is excellent, holding the reader's interest by its simplicity and directness. The use of the initials J. Q. A., to avoid the constant repetition of the rather cumbrous name John Quincy Adams, is to be regretted. In almost every case the name Adams could have been used without danger of confusion with John Adams or others.

In conclusion it may be said that the book satisfies a long-felt need in giving an entertaining, accurate, well-balanced account of one of the greatest figures in American history. If it is as widely read as it deserves, it will go far in interpreting for the public the "Old Man Eloquent", and in bringing to him many decades after his death in some measure the popularity which was denied him in life.

Princeton University. T. J. Wertenbaker.

Judicial Cases concerning American Slavery and the Negro. Edited by Helen Tunnicliff Catterall. Volume III., *Cases from the Courts of Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana.* (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1932. Pp. vii, 758.)

In this volume comprising cases from five states of the lower South, Mrs. Catterall maintains the same high standard of accuracy and execution which marked the other two, and the valuable introductions continue on the same scholarly plane. Like its predecessors it contains an abundance of useful documentary material pertinent to the study of social and economic history of the Old South. Cases involving redhibitory and criminal actions, manumissions and administrations, frequent the pages, and much light is thrown

upon prices and punishments, damages and debts, kidnapping and absconding, overseers and skilled laborers, diseases and medical attendance, separation of families and opposition to separation, and relations between blacks and whites. One may also find much of the social and political philosophy of such jurists as Joseph H. Lumpkin and Henry L. Benning, of Georgia, and Alexander Porter and Francois Xavier Martin, of Louisiana. The historian will find it impossible to make exhaustive studies of Julien Poydras, John McDonogh, Isaac Franklin, and other planters and traders without consulting judicial cases.

One of Mrs. Catterall's contributions in this and earlier volumes is a revelation of the importance of court records as source material. The published cases from the state tribunals of highest resort, together with the more inaccessible manuscript records preserved in county and parish court houses, provide detail and illustration which cannot be found elsewhere in such bulk. Until many of these have been carefully sifted, much of the history of the South will remain unwritten. Court records, however, are not unlike other historical materials; the "facts" in the cases are frequently unreliable and must be subjected to internal criticism.

A surprisingly large number of cases involve manumissions. Legislative acts and court decisions made emancipation increasingly difficult in Georgia where word order often served as a technicality to invalidate wills. Slaves could be sent to free territory and emancipated but they could not be manumitted and sent to free territory. A more liberal attitude prevailed in Alabama and the word order—emancipation and colonization—did not dissuade judges from permitting extra-territorial manumission. Official opinion in Mississippi opposed emancipation on several counts, and the Florida constitution forbade emancipation legislation. With the exception of Mississippi, bequests permitting choice between freedom and slavery, or the selection of a free domicile, were invalidated on the ground that slaves did not have power to choose.

There is much evidence in the present volume that slaves were more than chattels. The "crowning glory of our 'peculiar institutions' ", said a Florida judge in 1860, is "that whenever life is involved, the slave stands upon as safe ground as the master" (p. 121). Many slaves convicted of crimes, especially in Alabama, were granted new trials, and caution was exercised in admitting confessions obtained under duress. In Mississippi a white man was sentenced in 1821 to be hanged for the murder of a slave (pp. 283–284), and in Alabama another was convicted of manslaughter in 1859, fined $500, and sentenced to jail for six months (p. 233).

Nearly half of the third volume is devoted to Louisiana cases, occasioned in part by the slave trade at New Orleans, the prevalence of free negroes in the state, and the inclusion of numerous cases from the French and Spanish periods published originally in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*. The

Partidas prevented Spanish governors from marrying, and a paucity of white women led to concubinage with negroes. As the custom spread there developed a class of free persons of color whose testimony was admitted against white defendants by Louisiana courts. Litigation involving free negroes was so frequent that pages fairly bristle with the abbreviations, f. p. c., f. m. c., and f. w. c. Records from the French and Spanish periods introduce principles unusual in English colonies and illustrate the severity of the Spanish code.

As a modicum of miscellany, the reviewer noted two instances of speculation in slaves (though the exact connotation is not clear, pp. 57, 69); estimations of the cost of "raising negroes" (pp. 311, 356, 490, 557–558); proof of the prevailing Southern opinion that land and slaves were the safest of investments (p. 188); a projected slave insurrection that did not materialize (p. 141); a slave who considered suicide preferable to an exchange of masters (pp. 216–217); a blacksmithing partnership between a slave and a white man (p. 125); a Biblical defense of slavery (p. 27); an opinion that the epithet "abolitionist" would be equivalent in Louisiana to calling one a colored man (p. 529); judicial confusion in the post bellum period over how and when slavery was abolished; and a dozen dissertation subjects.

The Louisiana State University. WENDELL HOLMES STEPHENSON.

Varina Howell, Wife of Jefferson Davis. By ERON ROWLAND (Mrs. Dunbar Rowland). Volume II. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1931. Pp. x, 583. $4.00.)

ERON ROWLAND's second volume carries the story of Mrs. Jefferson Davis through the Civil War to her death in 1906. It is both more and less than a biography. There is all too little of the woman who was thought to be a real power in the Confederacy, and there is considerably more of war and war times than is necessary for background. Jefferson Davis still holds the center of the stage, and the plea that Strachey offers a "fair sized portrait of Albert" in his life of Victoria, will hardly justify the way in which the First Lady of the Confederacy is so often dragged in as an afterthought to interpretations of the War between the States.

This weakness, however, is in part atoned for by the quality of Mrs. Rowland's point of view. She makes it quite clear that Abraham Lincoln did not exhaust the means to peace in 1861, but that he blundered into war by following the advice of the Blairs and other radicals. She pictures Seward seeking delay and compromise and insists that "had he received the full and sympathetic coöperation of his party" he would have secured "conciliation between the states". She believes that the Confederate commissioners could have been received with profit and that Sumter might have been surrendered without loss of dignity. Just how all of this would have fitted into the Southern "fervor" for independence "little short of frenzy", we are not told.

The picture of Mrs. Davis that may be pieced together from different sections of the book is in sharp contrast to that given by Pollard. She may have influenced her husband in a few public matters, but it was only from a desire to coöperate with one on whom she believed "the whole responsibility of the war rested". She always discussed minor matters with him. When he was ill she handled less important visitors and carried their messages to him. She was persistent; she did keep well informed on public matters; and she did have ideas. But there is little evidence of actual ruling.

The social realm, however, was her own. She liked being the President's wife. She resented criticism and went out of her way to punish those who "ridiculed her ladies". She entertained the illusion of a European court, and soon her rules on punctuality and decorum were of the best Victorian brand. Some people were offended and took it out on the President. Others pointed out the extravagance of such display in a war-worn country. Varina justified it all on the basis of duty to the great body of soldiers and ladies always in Richmond.

The story of Mrs. Davis in flight and capture and in the years of peace is particularly well told. Jefferson Davis was ever her hero and never were name and fame more jealously guarded. Resourceful in securing his release from prison, ingenious in her defenses in the *Memoirs,* she lived on after his death with the one desire to give him a just place in history.

The volume is well written. The bias is no greater than in much that has been called sound history "from a Northern point of view". If there is no great body of personal letters, as one must believe from Mrs. Rowland's method, the First Lady of the Confederacy now has her due.

The University of Chicago. AVERY CRAVEN.

The March of Democracy. By JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS. Volume II., *From Civil War to World Power.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1933. Pp. xix, 438. $3.50.)

THERE is no special difference of method to distinguish Mr. Adams's second volume from its predecessor, but the narrative gains in continuity because, in the period dealt with, national issues increasingly predominate. What is gained in this respect, however, is at the expense of obvious neglect of the state and regional interests which students have more and more set themselves to explore. The main substance of the book, accordingly, does not deviate much from the traditional lines of good popular history save that the narrative is built out from time to time with allusions to literature, art, science, and religion, and punctuated with expressions of personal opinion and hortatory comments which suggest a conviction that the moral needs to be pointed and the tale adorned if the record is to carry its full weight.

Critical comment has little place in reviewing a work of this general

character. Mr. Adams's account of the election of 1860 gives him an opportunity to arraign the electoral system under which a majority of electoral votes does not necessarily mean a majority of the popular vote, but he admits that a Constitutional amendment which would effect "a reasonable reorganization of what is now a senseless system" would be difficult to secure. The "background of all sorts of intangibles" in the antagonism between the North and the South on the eve of the Civil War is pointed out, and certain excellencies in the Confederate States' constitution are noted notwithstanding that the document as a whole is adjudged "inferior". Seward's "inconceivably fantastic plan" of a foreign war, when revealed years later, showed "how complete an ass Seward had made of himself". Mr. Adams seems doubtful about the propriety of Lincoln's assumption of military authority in the Emancipation Proclamation, and permits himself one reference (p. 61) to the Confederates as "rebels". Civil War literature, Northern and Southern, is properly adjudged to have been of little permanent value. The account of military operations during the war is kept free of confusing details, and there are good but brief estimates of Lincoln and Johnson.

Mr. Adams is most successful in dealing with episodes, and on such varied topics as reconstruction policy, the scandals and weaknesses of the Grant administrations, the agrarian uprising and the silver controversy, the war with Spain, and the reform activities of Theodore Roosevelt he writes with evident interest. A single paragraph disposes of the panic of 1907, and a few lines suffice to introduce Woodrow Wilson in 1912, but the later appraisal of Wilson is discriminating, the World War is excellently described as far as the part of the United States is concerned, and the drab years of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover are pictured as they were.

The illustrations, more than 250 in number, most of them contemporary, maintain the high standard of appropriateness that was set in the first volume, and in themselves are a feature of outstanding merit.

New York. WILLIAM MACDONALD.

Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Japan, 1853–1895. By PAYSON J. TREAT, Professor of History at Stanford University. Two volumes. (Stanford University: University Press. 1932. Pp. xii, 593; ix, 600. $10.00.)

THESE two volumes constitute a *magnum opus,* or perhaps it would be more accurate to say a part of a *magnum opus,* which students of American-Japanese diplomatic relations hope Professor Treat some day will complete by bringing the story up-to-date. The present volumes cannot fail to inspire confidence in their author's vast learning in this field. They are written in strict accordance with the accepted canons of research. The preface informs the reader of the amount of research that has gone into the work—even to the

number of documents which have been consulted. There is an excellent bibliography, innumerable footnotes, and an unusually ample index. The proofreading has been done with care, and as a consequence there are no glaring errors in the spelling of the names of places and persons.

The first of these two volumes begins with a reprint, "revised and corrected", of a series of lectures delivered by Professor Treat before the Johns Hopkins University and originally published in 1917. The period from 1853 to 1865, covered by the reprinted chapters, includes the "opening" of Japan by Commodore Perry, and the work of Harris and Pruyn, the first two American representatives in Japan. The remainder of the material in the first volume brings the story to 1875, and contains such matters as the Iwakura mission of 1872, the case of the *Maria Luz*, a Peruvian "coolie ship", the Shimonoseki indemnity, and the Formosan expedition.

Throughout these years, until 1874, the policy of the American government was to act in concert with the other powers interested when the matters in question were of common concern, and independently in other matters. This policy of "coöperation" was never complete, but in matters of vital importance it held until 1874, when the United States, prompted by its diplomatic representative in Tokyo, attempted to negotiate independently a revision of the treaty of 1868. The problem of joint or individual action in their negotiations with the Japanese was one of the most troublesome matters with which the diplomatic corps in Tokyo had to deal. It was not until 1894 that results of first-rate importance were achieved by individual action, namely, the revision of the treaties by the British and American governments.

The second volume concerns itself mainly with two subjects, Treaty Revision and the Chino-Japanese War. Perhaps the most illuminating part of Professor Treat's work is in connection with the various efforts at treaty revision. For many years no success attended the efforts of the negotiators. First one difficulty and then another arose, and what the powers were willing to concede the Japanese cabinets were usually unable to accept. The British were insistent upon low rates of duties on imports into Japan, on the assumption, doubtless, that free trade was more desirable than protection both for their own nationals and the Japanese. The American government was willing to grant tariff autonomy to the Japanese but balked at reciprocal free immigration of laborers. It was the Japanese demand for recognition of "equality" with foreigners that presented the greatest difficulty, as it involved the abolition of extraterritorial privileges. The principal stumbling-block to revision was found in the unwillingness of the powers to commit their citizens to the jurisdiction of the Japanese courts and codes. Mixed courts with foreign judges were suggested and accepted by the Japanese cabinets only to meet with the violent opposition of the politicians in Tokyo, both before and after the establishment of the Japanese parliament in 1890. In the final event the Japanese won on nearly all counts and they signed the kind of treaty they

wanted, but the process was heartbreaking; how much so Professor Treat's chapters clearly reveal.

The last chapters of the second volume deal with the diplomacy of the Chino-Japanese War. There it seems to the reviewer that Professor Treat's pro-Japanese and anti-foreign bias sometimes gets the better of him. At any rate it is interesting to see in his record the way in which the Japanese, even in 1894, so conducted their negotiations with the Chinese as to comply strictly with the terms of their treaties with China, and yet to march on inexorably to the annexation of Korea, though nearly two decades were to elapse before the *dénouement* came.

It seems almost ungrateful to remark in connection with so excellent a product of scholarly research that the reader sometimes is offended by Professor Treat's intense nationalism as well as his pro-Japanese bias. Either one or the other and sometimes both combine to render Professor Treat's opinions about men or events less valuable than his information. However, it is in the main his disposition to sympathize with the Japanese ambitions that colors his judgments, although his unsympathetic estimate of Sir Harry Parkes reflects the workings of both biases.

Williams College. W. W. McLaren.

Papers relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1917. Supplements 1 and 2, *The World War.* Three volumes. [Publications of the Department of State.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1931; 1932. Pp. clvxi, 708; lxix, 796; xxxvii, 799–1323. $1.50; $1.50; $1.00.)

Two World War Supplements have been published by the Department of State to cover the year 1917: the first dealing generally with the last phases of American neutrality previous to April 6 and with certain aspects of relations with remaining neutrals after the entrance of the United States; the second dealing with the problems occasioned by America's active intervention. Supplement 1 follows, in its arrangement of papers, that of the preceding volumes in this series. It consists of a comparatively brief section devoted to the continuation and spread of the war and efforts for peace; a much longer section of 450 pages, the bulk of the volume, devoted to neutral rights; and two brief sections, neutral duties and miscellaneous problems. In Supplement 2, much the longest of any thus far issued and published in two volumes, the arrangement has perforce been altered to meet the change from a status of neutrality to one of belligerency. Part I., comprising all of the first volume, deals with the political, military, and naval conduct of the war, cooperation with the Allied powers, in these and other fields, and with the possibilities and terms of settlement; it amounts to 796 pages. Part II., which in preceding supplements has been devoted to the maintenance of neutral rights by the United States, becomes a section devoted to the practices and

principles employed by the United States as a belligerent toward neutral trade, including coöperation with the Allied governments in the control of commerce and the negotiations with the northern neutrals, concerning export and shipping with the Netherlands, Switzerland, and Spain. As in earlier supplements, the documents are preceded by a brief table of contents and a double list of the papers arranged in chronological sequence, first by topics and second by countries, with a summary of the contents of each paper. A brief but adequate index concludes each supplement.

The main argument of Supplement 1 is, first, the final effort of Wilson to bring about a peace conference, which might end the war toward which America was apparently heading, and, second, the effects of the German declaration of unrestricted submarine warfare that led directly to American participation. For purposes of reference the papers are extremely useful but they do not give much new information. Of Wilson's last peace move there is more to be learned from the publications of the German Reichstag Investigating Committee. The negotiations were conducted by Bernstorff and House, and not through the State Department. Lansing was apparently so little aware of what was going on that he declined to forward in cipher an important telegram from Bernstorff to Berlin, embodying a request of Wilson for the exact German terms; it was only when House intervened to explain that the cipher telegram was designed to assist the President's policy that it was sent. Some light is thrown on the attempt to initiate peace discussions with Austria-Hungary, after the rupture of relations with Germany; the conversations between Czernin and Penfield are chiefly interesting as indicating the futility of French and British expectations of detaching Austria-Hungary from Germany, expectations soon to be disappointed in the Sixtus negotiations. Czernin was definite and repeated in his assertion that no separate peace could be considered in Vienna; Penfield himself insisted upon this: "No offer at this time can induce the Minister to debate any arrangement meaning a breaking away from Austria's allies."

In Supplement 2 the chief interest is to be found in the papers relating to plans for coördinating the war effort of the United States with that of the Allies. As the chief of the British Intelligence wrote, "Germany's chief asset is the 3000 miles separating the Allies from New York". Perhaps the greatest contribution of America to victory was the leadership taken in developing a system of coördination that permitted the United States to expend its efforts in the direction where, at the moment, the results would count most. The papers will not of themselves permit the writing of a complete history of this extraordinary international organization; the editor has been compelled to make a selection and has wisely chosen those which emphasize the development of principles and agencies of coöperation rather than details of the problems involved. Many of the real difficulties do not appear and must be

studied in the private papers of the negotiators. Thus there is no suggestion in the official correspondence as to the way in which the crisis of July 3, 1917, occasioned by the $400,000,000 Morgan "overdraft", was met; nor would the correspondence indicate that for long weeks the Allied governments opposed Mr. McAdoo's plan for an inter-Allied finance council. None of the vital messages from Balfour *via* Wiseman and House to Wilson and their replies are published; probably Wilson kept no copies. But in the sum this collection will serve as the main basis for a history of the coördination of war effort. It makes plain that steps toward coördination were slow. The Balfour Mission of April, 1917, established good will but no definite agreements. Even in the matter of finance, then all-important, no specific program was set up, and in so far as Mr. McAdoo made tentative commitments the British misunderstood him. To meet the special needs of the situation, the British sent over, first, Lord Northcliffe (whose coming Lansing vainly attempted to hinder) and then Lord Reading; the French, André Tardieu. As the financial difficulties of the summer were met, adequately but with the utmost difficulty, the problems of supply loomed larger. To set up a machinery capable of solving them, the United States sent over a special war mission led by Colonel House, including representatives of the chief departments of supply, as well as General Bliss and Admiral Benson. They met first with the British and then with the representatives of the complete Inter-Allied Conference at Paris on November 29. It was this conference which paved the way ultimately to complete coördination, and which in the opinion of House proved the turning point in the war. The papers do not include the minutes of the conference (nor of the Supreme War Council), permission to publish which was refused by the other governments represented. Contrary to journalistic reports, the historian suffers little loss thereby. There is nothing of importance in the suppressed documents, for the decisions of moment were made in the small subcommittees and sections and the results are incorporated in the reports of the members of the American Mission, which are published in full.

The second topic of vital general interest in this period would naturally be that of American and Allied war aims. There is little information of the first importance on this in the collection of papers. We know from other sources that Wilson understood and feared the conflict with the Allies over this subject, and at first hoped to avoid open discussion of specific Allied purposes. Partly for this reason he refused to enter the alliance and was slow to permit American participation in the inter-Allied conferences if political matters were apt to arise. It was only after the demand from Russia for a statement on war aims became pressing that he changed his attitude. He knew from Balfour of the secret treaties of the Allies, and there is a reference in his telegram of December 1, 1917, to the Allied plans for the par-

tition of "Asia Minor". The State Department's knowledge of the secret treaties was vague, and Lansing was evidently unwilling to press the Allies for textual copies. As early as July, Jules Cambon in Paris referred to them and suggested that the United States might like to comment upon them. When he received the answer that the department would be glad to be informed of the nature of the agreements, he summarized briefly the gist of the treaties providing for the partition of Turkey. Nothing more appears until November, when Lansing telegraphed to Sweden asking our minister to send copies of the treaties published by the Bolsheviks, since they were being held up by the Allied censorship. The American entrusted with the translations "inadvertently left those papers" in Stockholm and it was not until December 27 that the translation of the treaties as published by the Soviets was received in Washington. Even then the documents were incomplete: the text of the correspondence forming the so-called Sykes-Picot Agreement and that of the Treaty of Bucharest with Roumania was represented merely by memoranda of the Russian foreign office. Until the end of the year the State Department was apparently uninformed of the St.-Jean de Maurienne Agreement with Italy and of the agreement with Japan regarding Shantung and the German islands south of the equator.

Yale University. CHARLES SEYMOUR.

SHORTER NOTICES

Sinn der Geschichte. Von Dr. Joseph Bernhart. *Urgeschichte der Menschheit.* Von Dr. Hugo Obermaier, Professor an der Universität in Madrid. [Geschichte der führenden Völker, herausgegeben von Heinrich Finke, *et al.*, Band 1.] (Freiburg im Breisgau, St. Louis, B. Herder Book Company, 1931, pp. xiv, 347, $3.50.) Dr. Bernhart's contribution may be looked upon as an introduction to this series. We shall therefore pass on to the chief topic: Obermaier's *Urgeschichte der Menschheit.* The author is already well known to prehistorians, especially of the Old World. It may be recalled that his *Der Mensch der Vorzeit* formed volume I. in a series entitled Der Mensch aller Zeiten, begun in 1912. His *El hombre fosil* appeared in 1916 (revised, 1925). With additions and alterations by the author, it was translated into English (*Fossil Man in Spain*) and published for the Hispanic Society of America in 1924.

In *Urgeschichte der Menschheit* we have all that was best in Obermaier's earlier works condensed and brought up to date. With respect to the chronology of prehistory, he has always been a conservative. In 1912 he referred the oldest known artifacts (Chellean) to the last Interglacial Epoch (Riss-Würm). In the present volume he accepts a pre-Chellean culture and refers it to the Second Interglacial Epoch (Mindel-Riss). But he is still conservative, in so far as the time element is concerned, when compared with the *Abbé* Breuil,

who would refer the pre-Chellean culture to the First Interglacial Epoch (Günz-Mindel).

The author makes use of the French terminology for the various epochs of the Old Stone Age, rather than the terminology recently proposed by Menghin. The Upper Paleolithic of northern Africa (Capsian) left its impress on the cultures of the northern shores of the Mediterranean, especially in southern Spain. The Lower Capsian is the equivalent of the Aurignacian, while the Upper Capsian corresponds to the Solutrean and Magdalenian of Europe. The transition from the Old Stone Age to the New is best characterized by the term "Epipaleolithic", a designation employed by the author as early as 1916.

The last chapter of Part I. deals with Fossil Man in the World outside of Europe: Africa, Asia, Australia, and America. Under Asia the author emphasizes the importance of the results obtained in Iraq and Palestine through expeditions sponsored jointly by the Sladen Fund and the British School of Archæology in Jerusalem on the one hand and by the American School of Prehistoric Research on the other.

Part II. of Obermaier's contribution deals with Man of the Neolithic Period and of the Prehistoric Ages of Metal. Its seventy-eight pages cover in condensed and admirable form the story of man's emergence from the epipaleolithic level of culture and his progress until his path was finally illumined by the dawn of history. References to the literature and a few well-chosen illustrations (14 text figures and 6 plates) contribute their share toward the completion of a work in keeping with the high standard set by the author in his earlier publications.

Yale University. G. G. MacCurdy.

Old Age among the Ancient Greeks: the Greek Portrayal of Old Age in Literature, Art, and Inscriptions, with a Study of the Duration of Life among the Ancient Greeks on the Basis of Inscriptional Evidence. By Bessie Ellen Richardson, Ph.D., Sometime Fellow in Archaeology, The Johns Hopkins University. [The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, no. 16, edited by David M. Robinson.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1933, pp. xv, 376, $4.00.) The purpose of this book is to consider the various aspects of old age in Greek literature of all periods, the influence and the representations of old age in Greek art, and the epigraphical evidence bearing upon the question of longevity among the Greeks. The work has been done with great industry and, on the whole, thoroughly, though in chapters II. and III. some use might well have been made of Plutarch's essay *An seni res publica gerenda sit.* The reason for inserting a complete list of the vases ascribed by Beazley to his "Old Age Painter" is not evident, and the value of the list of Greeks who are known to have lived sixty years or

more may be questioned. The evidence from inscriptions, for the most part tombstones, bearing upon the average duration of life among the Greeks is obviously inconclusive, but may indicate, as it appears to do, that the highest rate of mortality was between sixteen and twenty-five years and that not more than twenty-four per cent. lived more than forty years. But ages are by no means always recorded on tombstones. Concordances and catalogues occupy 124 pages. There is a good bibliography, and an index. The twenty-seven half-tones are excellent. Misprints and inadvertences are few; but Bougyzes for Bouzyges (list of illustrations and p. 96) is striking, and some, at least, of the references to Diogenes Laertius are incomplete (*e.g.*, p. 149, VII., 25 and VII., 4 for, VII., i, 25 and VII., vii, 4). More than half the text deals with old age in Greek art, and this is, as it should be, the best part of a book which may be recommended as an interesting and valuable work on a subject which has not before been comprehensively treated.

The Library of Congress. HAROLD N. FOWLER.

Ottaviano Capoparte: Storia politica di Roma durante le ultime lotte di supremazia. Due volumi. Per Mario Attilio Levi. [Storici antichi e moderni.] (Florence, "La Nuova Italia", 1933, pp. 264; 277, 30 l.) This thorough and readable book does not offer a great deal that is new, apparently having been called forth chiefly by the fact that there was no book on the subject written in Italian. There is new treatment of various minor points, however, and the point of view which the author gained by his constitutional studies often adds value to his discussions. He has attempted to present the chief characters without prejudice and has succeeded rather well, especially in the chapters on Antony in the Orient. Antony's identification of himself with Dionysus-Osiris and his "marriage" to Cleopatra as Aphrodite-Isis are recognized as moves to gain the allegiance of the Orientals. His donation of territory to Cleopatra and his new arrangements in the rest of Asia are recognized as attempts to strengthen the defenses against the Parthians.

There is no factual basis for the author's assertion (p. 93) that for 150 years there had been a succession of great statesmen and generals aiming at the conquest of the state. Scipio Africanus, whom it is a commonplace to call the first of them, had no such aim, and there was a long interval between him and Marius, who may perhaps be called the first. Few will agree that the emergence of great personalities caused what loss there was of enthusiasm for republican government among the plebeians; we must remember the gradual replacement of Italians by Orientals and the less independent mode of life of many citizens.

The Johns Hopkins University. RICHARD M. HAYWOOD.

Papsturkunden in England. Von Dr. Walther Holtzmann. Band I., *Bibliotheken und Archive in London.* Part I., *Berichte und Handschriften-*

beschreibungen. Part II., *Texte.* [Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, neue Folge, Band XXV., 1–2.] (Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1930, 1931, pp. 209; 213–658, 13 M.; 28 M.) Dr. Paul Kehr made a very happy choice of a collaborator in his task of editing papal documents before 1198, when he assigned to Dr. Holtzmann the papal archives in England. The first of the three volumes to be devoted to England maintains throughout the high standard Dr. Kehr has set in his own work. In this first volume, Dr. Holtzmann lists all the bulls found in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, St. Paul's Cathedral, Westminster Abbey, Lambeth Palace, St. Bartholomew's Hospital, the College of Arms, and the Society of Antiquaries, except for a few bulls which the editor wishes to collate with copies from archives outside London. The second volume will consist of material from the cathedral archives and libraries, and the third of Oxford, Cambridge, and private archives as well as what remains to be added from London. The present volume is in two parts, the first beginning with a brief introduction in which Dr. Holtzmann points out the peculiar difficulties in dealing with English monastic archives, difficulties arising not only from the secularization of the monasteries by Henry VIII., but also from the Hundred Years' War. English monastic archives are hopelessly scattered, and quantities of material still remain in private collections. For the archives investigated the editor gives a brief history of each of the collections and a description of the manuscripts, before listing the bulls. For each bull he gives the name of the pope, the opening words, and the identifying number in Jaffé-Loewenfeld's *Regesta,* if it is already included in that collection. In the second part of the first volume are published the full texts of 346 bulls, all the papal documents not included in Jaffé-Loewenfeld (or referred to by those editors only in manuscripts). The bulls are of the usual character—grants of protection, detailed confirmations of possessions, and general privileges, with occasional delegations of papal authority to try cases which had been appealed to Rome. Of the 346 documents, forty-one are originals. Only four go back of the Conquest, and but one of these is genuine. Alexander III., of course ranks first in the number of bulls issued—131; Celestine III. is second with seventy-three. There is appended a useful index of the recipients of papal privileges. Dr. Holtzmann is most competently performing an extremely important task.

The University of California. PAUL SCHAEFFER.

Franciscan Essays. Volume II. By F. C. Burkitt, H. E. Goad, and A. G. Little. [British Society of Franciscan Studies, Extra Series, volume III.] (Manchester, University Press, 1932, pp. xii, 103.) Supplementing its publication of critical works the British Society for Franciscan Studies issues an 'extra series' of more popular interest. In the collection of essays which make the third volume in this series, A. G. Little, the accomplished scholar

who is president of the society, after recounting the history, work, and aspirations of the organization, adds a fine appreciation of the career of St. Francis and also a discriminating comparison of Franciscan and Dominican chronicles: "If you want to know what happened, the Dominicans will be the safest guides: if you want to know the beliefs and feelings of the men of the time, consult the Franciscans."

Three more essays are from F. C. Burkitt: Fonte Colombo and its Traditions is of curious interest in relation to the first chapter of the *Speculum Perfectionis* and a fresco by Giotto. Brother Giles of Perugia is a psychological study. The essay on early biographies of St. Francis is not important for those already initiated in the problem of sources and hardly adapted for others.

The paper by Harold E. Goad on Brother Elias as the Leader of the Assisan Party in the Order is the outstanding feature of this publication. Having previously argued that the organized missions, the great friaries, the university schools are the true line of development of the Franciscan movement in distinction from 'the methods of the Portiuncula', Captain Goad now increases his divergence from Sabatier by discrediting reports of collision between the First Companions and Elias of Cortona after the death of the Saint. They are in concert with the effort of Elias and Gregory IX. to make Assisi the shrine and center of the Order by gathering and expending wealth in ways inconsistent with the spirit of the *Poverello.* The deposition of Elias in 1239 was due to the refusal of cosmopolitan doctors of Paris and Oxford to be governed by unlearned Umbrian laymen, a victory for the policy of absorption in the system of a hierarchic world. This admirably written discourse certainly throws light on Brother Elias, but more argument is necessary to shake our faith in Brother Leo and the Speculum—and Sabatier.

Lowell. F. A. Christie.

La loi de Gresham au Moyen Age: Essai sur la circulation monétaire entre la Flandre et le Brabant à la fin du XIV^e^ siècle. By Henri Laurent, associé C. R. B. à l'Université. [Travaux de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Bruxelles. Tome V.] (Brussels, Éditions de la Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1933, pp. ix, 208, 40 fr.) This study of fourteenth century currency problems contributes much to interest three distinct groups of readers: the political historians, the economic historians, and the historians of economic thought. Each phase of this complex episode is fully discussed and carried to a definitive conclusion. After Philip the Bold had added the County of Flanders to his possessions he proceeded to bring pressure to bear upon the Duchy of Brabant, then in the hands of his relative Jeanne who was the last representative of the direct line. By means of an alteration of the standards of the Flemish coinage in 1380–1381, a flow of specie from Brabant was established that soon drained the duchy of a large

part of its own circulating medium. When Wenceslaus, Jeanne's husband, died in 1383, Philip conceived hopes of securing the succession in Brabant, and as preliminary step proposed closer financial and administrative arrangements. As far back as 1339 an agreement had been concluded between Flanders and Brabant providing for the establishment of a common system of coinage. Arrangements to put this project into effect were concluded on July 16, 1384. As the receipts from the mints of Brabant were progressively reduced by a variety of administrative expedients, it was not difficult for Philip to induce the duchess to agree (June 12, 1389) to a fusion of the mints and an equal division of the receipts. The secret cession of the duchy to Philip, September 28, 1390, brought the political maneuver to its effective close.

Philip's policy was adopted with the explicit purpose of driving the currency of Brabant out of circulation. He and his ministers were familiar with Oresme's treatise, but carried his analysis further, reaching a conscious formulation of Gresham's law. The concept appears in 1392 in a letter of one of Philip's ministers, and the texts of the French translation of Oresme afford strong presumptions that the important passage on Gresham's law, known to be an interpolation, found its way into the text in Flanders at about this time.

Harvard University. ABBOTT PAYSON USHER.

Esquisse d'une histoire de l'Université de Caen. Par Henri Prentout, professeur à la Faculté des lettres. (Caen, Imprimerie Artistique Malherbe, 1932, pp. 193.) A work such as this offers the opportunity for viewing intellectual history, not in the great centers of thought, but in the provinces where, it may be urged, a better picture of the general characteristics of a culture-epoch can be obtained. Professor Prentout, who has already published numerous short studies on phases of the local university's history, has summarized here his researches of the last thirty years and published them in popular and readable form on the occasion of the university's fifth centenary. The result is not so much a contribution to the history of education as a picture of the relation of an academic organization to the cultural developments of four turbulent centuries. Sometimes, due to the limitations of the record, the picture is little more than a glimpse. The early phases show how in the fifteenth century even the educational institutions, always so conservative, were breaking away from medieval internationalism, and were also tending towards secular professional studies. The influence of the Renaissance seems somewhat vague, but the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, particularly the latter, made considerable college history. In this connection the reader is made to feel that the academic type is not peculiar to our times, when the author remarks "s'il y a un parti réformiste dans l'Université, il conserve toujours une certaine prudence"; or again "la modération est la vertu carac-

téristique de nos universitaires caennais à toute époque. Ils avaient été protestants, mais point jusqu'à la rupture avec la monarchie; ils avaient été jansénistes mais non jusqu'à la rupture avec Rome." Cartesianism, Gallicanism, the expulsion of the Jesuits, the new interest in science, all play their part in the life of the university, and the story culminates with the Revolution of which all the royal universities were victims.

There are not lacking occasional touches of humor such as the complaint of the Franciscans that a professor had argued that St. Francis's stigmata were merely figurative like those mentioned by St. Paul, or the agitation against the printing (instead of dictating) of the course in philosophy. Even students, of whom unfortunately we read very little, seem to have run true to form for we find in 1790 that they "désirent faire hommage à la *Patrie* des couronnes académiques offertes à leurs travaux", but in compensation for this patriotic gesture they "demandent—à être dispensés des compositions générales".

Williams College. RICHARD A. NEWHALL.

The Making of the State. By M. Ruthnaswamy, M.A. (Cantab.), Formerly Principal and Professor of History and Politics at Pachayappa's College, Madras. (London, Williams and Norgate, 1932, pp. 503, 21*s*.) In this volume the science of statesmanship is presented from the standpoint of India. Hence the book contains a rather elaborate discussion of topics which do not receive much attention in the general run of writings on political theory, for example, on the place of religion in the making of the state and on the services of custom to the unification of the state. Likewise there are discussions of caste, its influence, its advantages and defects, its relation to national progress, and the possibility of supplanting it by "some better form of social organization". The author believes that this institution is largely responsible for "the historical incapacity of India to form itself into one large united state".

Other chapters are devoted to the leading political philosophies, the practice of government, and the economic basis of the state. There are some illuminating pages on Man as Maker of the State and the book closes with a survey of the political history of India from earliest times. The author, in this concluding chapter, maintains a strictly objective attitude. He is neither pro-British nor anti-British. In the Gandhi movement he recognizes a most formidable native reaction against this outside suzerainty, due to the fact that "there is much the British might have done which they have not done, and much they have done which they ought not to have done" (p. 481). But he thinks it worth raising the question whether anyone else would have done better. "On the village organization of Hindu India, and on the provincial organization of the Muslims, the English have built a well-knit system", so that India has been "set on the road to its own making" (p. 482).

The Making of the State is the work of one who has read widely and thoughtfully. A deep patriotism pervades the whole book, with a yearning for the national unity of the author's homeland. The service of religion in India has divided man from man, he says, but the service of the state will weld them together again. India's mission is to stand forth as the guardian and trustee of the idea of the state in the lands of the East. The book is well worth the attention of those who are interested in the background of Indian politics.

Pasadena. WILLIAM B. MUNRO.

Facts and Factors in Economic History: Articles by Former Students of Edwin Francis Gay. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1932, pp. x, 757, $6.00.) This book, containing articles by some of his former students, was presented to Professor Gay at a dinner given on the occasion of the completion by him of twenty-five years of service at Harvard University. The reach of the influence of a successful teacher is shown by the fact that the thirty-four contributors to this volume are on the faculties of twenty-one different colleges and universities and in half a dozen different businesses, scattered over the whole United States and Canada. The catholicity of Professor Gay's own interests is evidenced by the wide spread of the subjects treated: among the countries examined are the United States, Canada, England, Greece, Japan, and Spain, while the subjects discussed cover population, public finance, labor, shipping, commercial policy, manufactures, banking, railroads, agriculture, politics, marketing, public utilities, reparations, and inventions.

It is invidious to select for mention particular articles among so many of merit, but a group of essays on phases of early English economic history—a field in which Professor Gay did most of his own work—deserves special note. Three essays on Spanish economic history also received their original stimulus from Professor Gay. A rather miscellaneous group of nine essays deal with various aspects of American economic development, the new technology is discussed in at least two. A cosmopolitan flavor is added by a description of Bata, the unique Czechoslovakian shoe manufacturer, a discussion of textile industries in Japan, and a history of reparation ideas.

The volume is not merely a deserved tribute to a recognized economic historian; it contains some real contributions to the field in which these contributors, as students, received their training.

The University of Illinois. E. L. BOGART.

The Revolt of the Netherlands, 1555–1609. By P. Geyl, Lit.D., Professor of Dutch History and Institutions in the University of London. (London, Williams and Norgate, 1932, pp. 310, 12*s*.) It has not been difficult for Professor Geyl to prove that he was fully justified in publishing a new ac-

count in English of the rise of the Dutch Republic. Motley's celebrated work on this subject and its sequel, *The United Netherlands,* were severely criticized in 1862 by R. Fruin. But Fruin's lengthy review, although it was reprinted in the third volume of his *Verspreide Geschriften,* has remained little known in this country and in England. It should be noted, however, particularly so since Professor Geyl ignores the fact in his own book, that there has been available for many years an English translation of P. J. Blok's excellent history of the Dutch people. Furthermore, G. Edmundson's *History of Holland* is upon the whole a fairly accurate and very well written production. It cannot be said that Professor Geyl's volume makes such pleasant reading.

"The truth is", says Geyl, "that Motley . . . was so little interested in the problems of Netherlands history that he never took the trouble to get up the necessary information about them." This statement may be a trifle too strong, but it is an illustration of the curious fact that American historians for the past seventy-five years have collectively shown little interest in the history of Europe from 1500 to 1700.

Professor Geyl's principal contribution consists in his brilliant exposition of the reasons why the revolt against Spain broke out in the southern provinces and why the northern subjects were separated from their kinsmen in the south. Even in Belgium and Holland it has not been generally understood that religious divergencies were of lesser consequence than the highly successful diplomatic and military activities of Alexander Farnese, Duke of Parma. Further light on the career of this consummate diplomat is now being shed by Professor L. van der Essen of the University of Louvain. His conclusions are likely to confirm the contentions of Professor Geyl.

The University of Michigan. A. Hyma.

Documents concerning English Voyages to the Spanish Main, 1569–1580. By I. A. Wright, B.A., F.R.Hist.S. [Works issued by the Hakluyt Society, Second Series, No. LXXI.] (London, the Society, 1932, pp. lxiv, 348.) The tale of English depredations against Spanish America during the sixteenth century crowds a glamorous chapter in the history of European expansion. It involves much that was heroic, much that was dastardly; there is romance, with a generous share of stark realism.

Much depends upon the individual point of view. To the English, the participants were gallant knights of the sea, "freebooters" highly deserving of the plaudits and honors which fell to them upon their triumphant return. To the Spaniards, on the other hand, they were pirates, rascals of the deepest dye, for whom death at the half-mast was the only fitting end. Small wonder then that their daring exploits have become legendary in both worlds and that in our own day, Peruvian mothers still use the sinister threat that "the

Dragon" (Sir Francis Drake) is lurking without, waiting to carry off bad children.

Contemporary English accounts of descents upon the Main have long been available for students. The highly illuminating Spanish records dealing with these events have, on the other hand, been reposing in the General Archive of the Indies at Seville, their very existence known to but few. The Hakluyt Society's recent *Spanish Documents concerning English Voyages to the Caribbean, 1527–1568* was therefore given a hearty welcome. The present volume, consists of two parts, the first of seventy-three papers from the collection at Seville, and the second, English versions of the same affairs. The relationship between the two sets of accounts and the manner in which they complement each other is admirably illustrated by documents 17–31 of Part I., and Philip Nichols's *Sir Francis Drake Revived,* reprinted as the first item in Part II., both covering Drake's voyage of 1572–1573. Doubt long cast upon the veracity of the latter is entirely dispelled by Spanish reports transmitted home and here first published.

Miss Wright's translation and editing merit the highest praise. Specially drawn maps greatly facilitate use of the volume. The index, alas, is poor; the binding, worse.

The George Washington University. LOWELL JOSEPH RAGATZ.

Ospiti romeni in Venezia, 1570–1610: Una storia ch'è un romanzo ed un romanzo ch'è una storia. By N. Jorga. (Bucharest, 1932, pp. 158, 21 illustrations.) This study is based on an interesting series of letters in Greek and Italian, given to Jorga by a Venetian, a former fellow student, and sent to Moscow during the war, with other Roumanian treasures. They deal with the vicissitudes of Mihnea, ruler of "Hungro-Wallachia" under the Turkish suzerainty in the late sixteenth century, and his unfortunate son; most of the earlier letters are from Caterina, Mihnea's mother, to her sister Marioara, resident in a Murano convent, and a friend of Paul Veronese. Jorga adds numerous letters of bankers and business men, and a diffuse and discursive commentary, which gives many details of the complicated relations between the Porte and the Roumanian tributaries. Caterina is the heroine of the story—a woman of energy and ambition, who sacrificed everything to her son's advancement; Marioara, at first apparently a petulant poor relation, develops sturdy qualities as the action progresses; Mihnea, never of heroic build, surprises us finally by apostasy, and a Turkish career as Mehmed Bey; various contemporaries, like Peter the Lame and Michael the Brave, move past on the stage; and we are amused by poor Kühbach's typically Nordic horror over the depravity of these Oriental Wallachs. The excellent reproductions are partly architectural, partly of contemporary documents; there are no facsimiles of the letters, now inaccessible under the Soviets.

The text is full of misprints, and the style often hard to follow; there is no index; but the book contains much interesting and valuable material.

The College of the City of New York. CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

The Mission of Rinuccini, Nuncio Extraordinary to Ireland, 1645–1649. By Michael J. Hynes, M.A., Ph.D., docteur en Sciences historiques (Louvain), Professor St. Mary's Seminary, Cleveland, Ohio. (Dublin, Browne and Nolan, 1932, pp. xxiii, 332, 12*s* 6*d*.) Professor Hynes has put together a full narrative of the mission of Rinuccini, papal nuncio extraordinary to Ireland during the period 1645–1649, and for this purpose he has used contemporary documents, particularly the so-called *Nuncio's Memoirs*, which were compiled during the early 1660's by O'Ferall and O'Connell, apologists for Rinuccini. Professor Hynes himself does not come forward as an apologist. But he is anxious to show that historians have given less care to consideration of the case for Rinuccini than to that for his enemies, and he argues that a balanced study of Irish affairs during the period 1645–1649 not only frees Rinuccini from the blame of having hindered the Catholic cause, but makes plain the zeal and wisdom of his policy.

It is hard to grant so much, even after reading Professor Hynes's version of the story. He proves that Rinuccini was a zealous and active leader of the Catholics throughout the whole period of the mission. He proves that the mission was sure to fail, because there was no chance that the hatreds which were then well established in Ireland—family, racial, territorial, political—would suddenly disappear at the behest of the pope and the Catholic clergy. What Professor Hynes does not bring into prominence is the violent and uncompromising nature of the policy which Rinuccini followed.

Rinuccini was an aggressive, ambitious man. His handiest instruments were excommunication and the sword, and his policy dealt only in complete and final victories. The full account of his mission would be a study in light and shade. It would contrast the evil effects of the policy which he imposed upon the Catholic party with the tale of his virtues and difficulties. It would go at a varying pace. Professor Hynes has been content with an unrelieved progression of events and the plan of his work has depressed his style. It was, perhaps, responsible for occasional imperfections of grammar and uncertainty in the use of tenses.

Cornell University. FREDERICK GEORGE MARCHAM.

Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, relating to English Affairs, existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in other Libraries of Northern Italy. Edited by Allen B. Hinds, M.A. Volume XXXIII., 1661–1664. (London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1932, pp. liv, 392, £1 10*s*.) This volume of the Calendar covers the period from July 1, 1661, to March 27,

1664. Giavarina, who had been Venetian resident in England since 1656 continued so until 1663, when he was called away at the end of an inglorious dispute with the English government on the question whether the privileged position which he enjoyed as a diplomat made his beer free from taxes. Riccardi who succeeded him had no formal diplomatic status and sent his few dispatches by way of the Venetian ambassador in France. Correr and Morosini, ambassadors extraordinary, were in London during the summer of 1661 to express the satisfaction of the doge and senate upon the restoration of Charles. They carried on the regular correspondence for a time and on returning to Venice presented to their masters a long "relation" of the state of England.

The news concerning England which the Venetian correspondents sent home during this period had no great originality. Giavarina lacked special connections at court and lacked also the ambition to search for news. At the back of his mind was the desire to be withdrawn from England, "a country always animated by strange events, always subject to serious peril, never free from expense and unbearable discomforts". Correr and Morosini gathered more interesting news. Their business put them closely in touch with the great and especially with Charles, from whom they drew the remark, "You see, sirs, I am not yet well re-established". This was in August, 1661, but the face value of the statement must be discounted by the fact that Charles used it as a preliminary to explaining why he could not assist Venice in her war with the Turk.

Mr. Hinds in translating these papers continues to use, as in earlier volumes, an English style which can be justified only on the ground that it attempts to reproduce the sentence structure of the original Italian. It is not good seventeenth century English. It is not good modern English. And all who read the sentence at the top of page 161, which contains 126 words and has eight preliminary clauses before it arrives at the subject, will pray that in later volumes a more happy medium may be used.

Cornell University. FREDERICK GEORGE MARCHAM.

A London Merchant, 1695–1774. By Lucy Stuart Sutherland, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Somerville College, Oxford. [Oxford Historical Series, Volume II.] (London, Humphrey Milford; New York, Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. viii, 164, $3.00.) "This study is presented to the reader as an essay in what the Americans had called, rather infelicitously, 'business history', in the economic mechanism of a certain state of society." It is based on the ledgers, journals, cashbooks, and shipping papers of the brothers Braund, English business men of the eighteenth century.

William Braund, from whom most of the papers are derived, spent most of his life as a merchant in trade with Portugal. He started as an exporter,

shipping English woolens and worsteds for payment in bills of exchange. After the Lisbon earthquake of 1755 and the beginning of the Seven Years' War he abandoned this trade to become an importer of bullion, for which, in turn, he paid with bills drawn by English and Continental merchants. The papers show the complexity of this trade in a period of war, when England still clung to bimetallism.

After 1763 Braund changed again the nature of his business to apply as an underwriter of marine insurance the considerable wealth which he had acquired; meanwhile he had invested also in the stock of the East India Company, and in shipping employed in the company's service. The larger part of Miss Sutherland's book is composed of material illustrating Braund's fortunes in these activities. The chapter on marine insurance in the mid-eighteenth century illuminates what has been an obscure period in the rise of the group of individual underwriters who gradually were organized as Lloyd's; concrete details from the accounts and statistical tables give an excellent picture of the insurance business of the time. Of interest and value, moreover, is the chapter on the East India shipping organization, illustrating the institution of the "permanent bottom", and describing the respective parts of ships' husbands, commanders, and owners.

The author, so far as I can judge, has made excellent use of the accounts at her command, combining with them much pertinent material from contemporary sources, both printed and written. The book is a substantial contribution to the history of commercial and financial organization.

Yale University. CLIVE DAY.

The Stuart Pretenders: a History of the Jacobite Movement, 1688–1807. By Sir Charles Petrie, Bt., M.A. (Oxon.). (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1933, pp. vi, 313, $3.50.) Avoiding common misconceptions of the Jacobite movement as either a romance or spasmodic disease of eighteenth century Britain, Sir Charles Petrie has closely adhered to his purpose of telling the story of Jacobitism "as a definite political movement". His delightfully written sketch corrects traditional distortions of what was once a vital and serious factor in British politics and enables us, for the first time, to view the checkered fortunes of the Stuart Pretenders as a continuous whole.

It is from the point of view of the Jacobites themselves that he recounts their aims and difficulties, sharply condemns their blunderers, extols their heroes, and laments their failures. Although he never allows himself to be so captivated by the Stuarts as to be blind to their individual faults, the narrative is throughout inspired by the author's unconcealed conservatism which inclines him to dismiss the Hanoverians as boorish usurpers who had "very little right to the Crown" and to regard Charles Edward's retreat from Derby as a tragic turning point in English history. Petrie's approach is in harmony with that growing current tendency to reappraise conservative forces and

characters so unsympathetically treated by Whigs of the last century. But at times he is swayed by his reactionary zeal toward very dubious judgments. In contrasting the severe punishment meted out to Oxford by George I. in 1715 with the comparative mildness of James II. on an earlier occasion, he forgets that while a royalist Oxford had opposed James only when the latter's Catholicizing policy had led him to violate university privileges, George I. had to deal with a university that was frankly disloyal. To deplore the "constitutional stagnation" of the eighteenth century is to shut one's eyes to important developments in cabinet and parliamentary government, and to suggest that England's misfortunes in recent times are traceable to the expulsion of the Stuarts is little short of fantastic.

The later chapters dealing with the "Forty-five" and the rapid decline of Jacobitism thereafter are superior to the more superficial treatment of the genesis and early phases of the movement. It is particularly regrettable that Petrie does not elucidate his vague references to the "old Cavalier spirit" by linking his narrative with its social setting, since the firm rooting of the doctrines of Divine Hereditary Right and passive obedience in the English Church, universities, and squirearchy alone makes the later history of Jacobitism intelligible. On the other hand, his analysis of the Elibank Plot leaves nothing to be desired for thoroughness and scholarly caution. The rehabilitation of William Shippen, who ably led the Constitutional Jacobites in the Commons for some twenty years, is but one instance where traditional estimates require the considerable modification urged throughout this provocative book.

Harvard University. HAROLD B. NEWMAN.

Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal, being an Account of the Connections between the British Isles and the Jansenists of France and Holland. By Ruth Clark, Professor of French at Wellesley College. (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. xviii, 360, $4.75.) This very commendable and patient investigation deals with Britishers having had personal contact with Port Royal and the attitude of British Protestants and Roman Catholics toward Jansenism. The first part is an interesting gallery which includes, necessarily, some well-known personalities about whom the author, despite minute research, is unable to contribute much new material. It is so, for instance, for the taciturn Port Royal gardener, Monsieur François, of whom Sainte-Beuve gives such a delightful portrait. But in other cases the writer adds valuable information as, for example, in that of Ludovic Stuart d'Aubigny, immortalized by Sainte-Beuve as the "Saint-Evremond de Port Royal". Making use of archives, chiefly those of the Affaires étrangères, the author shows the efforts of Aubigny and his friends, including Charles II., to obtain for him the hat of a cardinal. Accusa-

tions of being a Jansenist, though he was a very lukewarm one, delayed his promotion to the very time of his death. The relations of Port Royal with British exiles, especially the English Benedictines, are also dealt with in the light of little known material.

How was Jansenism received in the British Isles? The Protestants, according to evidence gathered by Miss Clark, looked upon the Jansenists as "the better kind of papists". As for the Roman Catholics, they do not seem to have been greatly influenced by Jansenism, despite numerous accusations, and though it found friends such as Blackloe and Henry Holden, such also as Dr. Richard Short, a devoted admirer of Quesnel, who supervised the translation of his *Réflexions morales* into English. On the whole, Dodd was probably right in stating: "Most of the Roman Catholics in England had heard of the Name of Jansenists, but few were thoroughly instructed what sort of cattle they were."

Ireland was very much on its guard against Jansenism. However, an Irish bishop, Luke Fagan, consented to ordain twelve young Dutchmen of the church of Utrecht deprived of its archbishop. Among the Irish abroad are to be found friends of Jansenism but mostly adversaries, for instance those who, by condemning the Five Propositions provoked the "Affaire des Hibernois", in 1651.

In Scotland, Jansenism gained a little ground probably through the influence of the Innes family who taught at the Collège des Écossais in Paris. Many of its students went to Scotland as missionaries.

The book ends with an interesting account of a pilgrimage to Port Royal by Mrs. Schimmelpenninck in 1814.

Vassar College. MARIA TASTEVIN MILLER.

Imprimeurs et libraires de l'Anjou. Par *l'Abbé* Émile Pasquier, docteur en Théologie, et Victor Dauphin. (Angers, Société Anonyme des Éditions de l'Ouest, 1932, pp. 403.) This is a very complete and comprehensive treatment of the subject of printers and booksellers in one province of France. The *abbé* says that the fact that he could find nothing on the subject in 1890 was a challenge to him to do the work, but it was only the past year that it was completed. It seems to be almost unique for France, as far as can be determined from the printed lists or histories. In England such work has been furthered by the Bibliographical Society, and in this country by the Bibliographical Society of America and by Douglas C. McMurtrie's publications. But the task is easy here compared to Anjou where printing was introduced in 1478 and where there were legal restrictions, not always observed, upon the number of printers.

The book covers Anjou, but mainly deals with Angers. Printing was first started at Angers in 1478, the fifth place in France. It continued, with breaks,

until in 1648 four printers were allowed. At Saumur printing flourished during the period of the Protestant Academy, 1600–1685. At La Flèche there were printers from 1575. These are the main locations of the printers in Anjou. A chapter is given to each place, listing every printer, bookseller, lithographer, and binder, together with the works printed. This will prove a valuable bibliographical aid beyond what is already available. Indeed much care has been given to description of some works, for example those of Clément Alexandre at Angers. The author also discusses technique, type, the number of workmen, printers, marks, paper and paper mills.

The government watched printing very carefully. The number of printers in France was reduced in 1618 from 270 to 240, and in 1686 to 120. In 1739 the number was increased to thirty-six for Paris and 214 for the rest of France. A few years later there were eight in Anjou. The French Revolution established liberty of the press but under Napoleon there was regulation again. Even with regulation there were twenty of this group in Angers, Saumur, and La Flèche. After vicissitudes, the laws of 1870 and 1881 made printing free.

The book is equipped with chronological tables, a list of proper names, and an index. With all this careful and full detail it would take an expert who has spent as many years as *Abbé* Pasquier on this particular field to find any minor flaws in this valuable bibliographical and historical work.

Grosvenor Library, Buffalo. A. H. Shearer.

Gibbon's Antagonism to Christianity . . . and the Discussions that it has provoked. By Shelby T. McCloy. (Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1933, pp. 400, $4.00.) How many famous names are found on the list of champions who took up the glove thrown by Gibbon in the face of Christianity! Among them are Paley, Priestley, Coleridge, Mackintosh, Newman, Bowdler (who gelded the historian as he had gelded Shakespeare), Belloc, Guizot, and Milman. And there were many other defenders of the faith of less note. And yet how little of the controversy has survived. A few epigrams are all that remain of it in the memory of any but very devoted specialists: "Sapping a solemn creed with solemn sneer"; "his humanity never slumbers unless when women are ravished or the Christians perescuted"; "he should have warned us of our danger, before we entered his garden of flowery eloquence by advertizing 'Spring-guns and man-traps set here' "; "he writes like a man who had received some personal injury from Christianity and wished to be revenged on it".

The great bulk of the controversy has lapsed into oblivion not so much because Gibbon's replies were, as Walpole called them, "the quintessence of argument, wit, temper, spirit and consequently of victory", as because the question at issue has lost its savor. But, as a fragment of the intellectual his-

tory of the last century and a half, the long warfare of history and religion, as described in Mr. McCloy's careful and exhaustive study, is extremely interesting and instructive. A surprisingly large mass of materials has been unearthed and examined; some new items of interest are added to those already accessible; and the results of the investigation have been set forth in a style only lacking in color because of its determined attempt at complete objectivity.

In the reviewer's judgment Gibbon's antagonism to Christianity has been overemphasized not only by his opponents but by admirers, J. B. Bury and Mr. McCloy. The view that Christianity was the main cause of the decline of the Roman Empire, though widely attributed to Gibbon, can hardly bear examination. His statement, in chapter XXXVIII., "the decline of Rome was the natural and inevitable effect of immoderate greatness", though much less quoted than the famous "I have described the triumph of barbarism and religion", really expresses the historian's etiology quite as well. Be it remembered that his first plan for a large history turned to the rise of the Swiss Republic for a subject, and abandoned it because of the difficulties of the German language. In short, there is more in Gibbon than is commonly seen by his readers and disciples.

Cornell University. PRESERVED SMITH.

France et Afrique du Nord avant 1830: Les précurseurs de la conquête. Par F. Charles-Roux. [Collection du centenaire de l'Algérie.] (Paris, Félix Alcan, 1932, pp. 749, 65 fr.) Five hundred and sixty years elapsed between the fatal crusade of Saint Louis against Tunis and the fall of Algiers to France. It would be easy to indicate, and hard to establish, a real continuity of French yearnings toward North Africa during this long period. M. Charles-Roux states this frankly at the outset; but the projects he digs up are astonishingly numerous and close together.

Most of the material, though not all of it, was available already, but in scattered form. Some use of archives is made. The great service performed by the book is twofold. For the special student of North Africa it is a useful synthesis with an orderly bibliography and table of contents. For the general student of Mediterranean and French history, it is a mine of information not found in manuals and a key to complicated special subjects such as the long development of French trading posts in the Barbary States. Mazarin refused to buy Tangier from the Portuguese, though Colbert urged the purchase. Tabarka in Tunis and Djidjelli in Algeria were favorite French objectives down into the eighteenth century. The Spanish expedition of 1775 against Algiers and the various plans for taking the place drawn up by Consul de Kercy from 1782 on marked the shift of interest. Boutin's reconnaissance of 1808 for Napoleon was the basis of the actual operations of 1830, but Kercy's scheme in its final form was similar.

There are many side lights in these 725 pages of text, including the genesis of French interest in Egypt and the continuity of Sicilian interest in Tunis from the Norman assaults of the twelfth century. This is a competent and useful book, worthy of the series in which it appears.

University of California. M. M. KNIGHT.

The States of Europe, 1815–1871: a Study of their Domestic Development. By R. B. Mowat, Professor of History in the University of Bristol. (New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1932, pp. 408, $6.00.) As Leopold von Ranke turned to the letters of the Venetian ambassadors for a story of the politics of the European states, so Professor Mowat turns to the unpublished dispatches of British diplomats for new light upon Continental history. The thought that governs his interpretation is that modern Europe was made in the period 1814–1871. "In that time most of the best minds of Europe, most of the political élite, looked to the national and parliamentary principle as the solvent of Europe's ills." Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Germany paid in 1918 the penalty for the denial of one or the other of these principles in 1871.

Needless to say, Professor Mowat finds nothing in the Public Record Office to contradict this thesis. The British diplomats throughout the nineteenth century enjoyed an inward conviction that the measure of excellence in a European state was the degree to which its government resembled that of England, and their analyses of political conditions in Europe naturally reflected this conviction, and consequently ignored or misunderstood the essential federalist character of the political problems of central Europe. Mowat's account of the constitutional experiments in the Hapsburg monarchy from 1849 to 1867 show the unhappy consequence of preferring the testimony of British diplomats who were on the ground, but did not understand the problem, to that of recent historians such as Eisenmann and Joseph Redlich. Naturally from his premises Mowat commends the disastrous compromise of 1867, and while admitting that it gave the Magyars too much weight in the councils of the empire, praises the result that "Austria attained at last to a liberal system of constitutional government". If he had examined Austrian constitutional history from the Austrian rather than the English standpoint he would have realized that the vital question was the relation of territories and peoples to each other, not the relation of a parliament to an executive. In the same way he follows the wishful thinking of the British ruling class in the eighteen-fifties in holding that the seven million affirmative votes for Napoleon III. "cannot be considered of much significance".

These two errors are deep; they have led to grievous disillusionments in recent years. Did not the conception of the world made safe for democracy reflect this assumption that British political experience could be taken as

universal rather than insular, that dictatorship and popular consent were antithetic, and that the British type of responsible government, though it had failed to solve the Irish question, was the very thing for Austria?

Western Reserve University. ROBERT C. BINKLEY.

La question romaine de Pie VI. à Pie XI. Par G. Mollat, professeur à l'Université de Strasbourg. [Bibliothèque de l'enseignement de l'Histoire ecclésiastique.] (Paris, J. Gabalda and Company, 1932, pp. 469, 24 fr.) Here is another volume in the series begun in 1897, under the auspices of Leo XIII., with the object of composing "a universal history of the Church, put in accord with the latest historical criticism". The Roman Question is selected as "raising a politico-religious problem of the highest order, namely: Whether the temporal power is essential to the Church in the accomplishment of its spiritual mission on earth". Once posed this question is left in the background while the author, with admirable impartiality and care, traces the historical vicissitudes of the temporal power from the outbreak of the French Revolution through 1929.

Not a textbook, nor a popularization, but intended as a manual of advanced instruction, "as well as for members of the clergy and the Catholic *élite*", Professor Mollat's study is a model. It is close-packed, thorough, balanced, and clear. It will be a precious aid to students of the history of Italy, as well as to those primarily interested in the Church. It is evident that for Professor Mollat the pope's defense of his sovereignty, as essential to his independence, is the good cause, however unskillfully or even stupidly conducted; but the author is consistently a scholar, appealing only to the facts, which he has obtained from sources wherever possible, or from the best and latest authorities; and he presents carefully, concisely, and fairly both sides of the tangled questions which the conflicts of the popes with the secular governments of Italy have raised.

The full bibliographical equipment, prepared with fine impartiality of selection and comment, carefully classified, and covering archives, printed sources, periodicals, and authoritative studies, would alone make this little volume invaluable.

The principal weakness of the book grows out of the author's imperfect sympathy with the cause of Italian nationality. For him the *Risorgimento* was merely a revolt of decent sentiment against the extremes of the reaction, in and out of the Papal State, and was directed by its leaders with an outrageous disregard of the rights of their opponents. A deeper study of the Italian revolution would have made even more convincing Professor Mollat's thesis that the secularization of the Papal State was inevitable and was hastened by the failure of the popes to reform their government more promptly and decisively. On the other hand the recent accord of the Church

with Fascist Italy lends color to his admiration of the patient and stubborn tenacity of the popes in maintaining intact the doctrine of their temporal independence.

The Johns Hopkins University. KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD.

Increasing Return: a Study of the Relation between the Size and Efficiency of Industries with Special Reference to the History of Selected British and American Industries, 1850–1910. By the late G. T. Jones. Edited by Colin Clark, Lecturer in Statistics in the University of Cambridge. (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. xvi, 300, $4.50.) This is the posthumous book of a brilliant young English economist who supplemented five years at Cambridge University by two years of research in the United States as a Laura Spelman Rockefeller Fellow. It represents an application of mathematical economics to a historical study of the relative efficiency of certain types of industrial organization in the British and the American cotton and pig iron manufacture and in the London building trades. Cost trends in these branches of production were downward during the latter part of the nineteenth century, but had ceased to fall or had risen during the period immediately preceding the author's investigation. This relative stability suggests nearer equilibrium between forces that tend to enhance costs, like growing scarcity of raw materials and an increase of internal friction among the parts of steadily growing industrial organizations, and counterbalancing forces, like expanding markets and the mechanical and distributive economies of larger producing units, that pull in the opposite direction. The chief interest of the book lies in its statistical technique. Changes in economic conditions since it was written might modify in some degree the form of its conclusions.

The Library of Congress. VICTOR S. CLARK.

Toward the New Spain. By Joseph A. Brandt. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1933, pp. xiii, 435, $4.00.) Emilio Castelar, the outstanding figure of the first Spanish Republic, characterized that régime as "a republic of wit and poetry". It was rather one of pathos, error, and tragedy. Mr. Brandt in his *Toward the New Spain* has given an interesting and detailed account of the republic of 1873 and the republican movement in Spain. The first half of the volume outlines the decadence of the monarchy, the reign of Isabel II., the government by *pronunciamiento,* the growing dissatisfaction, the revolution of 1868, and the expulsion of the queen. The attempt to secure a monarchical solution through Amadeo of Savoy and its failure are described. The liberal and republican theories and programs promulgated during the monarchy are detailed. Then came the republic before Spain was adequately prepared. The author traces its course and

portrays its leaders. They were intellectuals and idealists, each with his own pet ideas. They lacked the political acumen and practical administrative experience to achieve success and failed to attract to their cause enough experienced men of the old régime to effect their purpose. They faced the problems of the church, the army, agrarian reform, education, labor, and above all, the question of the form of government—federalism or centralism. Five presidents were chosen in two years, no constitution was adopted, and the republic collapsed over the problem of federalism.

The best chapter, The End of an Intellectual Adventure, is a summary of the factors involved in the failure of the republic of 1873. A concluding chapter is devoted to events during the Bourbon restoration, which led to the republic of 1931. The author points out the similarity of the problems in these two political experiences of Spain and the lessons the present republic may learn from its predecessors. He indicates the intellectual leadership of the second republic, but he might have noted that on this occasion numerous able and experienced leaders of the old régime are participating in the new government. A bibliography is appended, but the basis of choice of titles is not apparent. Of some two hundred titles, over fifty are by Castelar or about him. In view of the paucity of English works, Clarke's *Modern Spain, 1815–1898,* and Hume's *Modern Spain, 1788–1898,* should have been included. Comparison with Sánchez Alonso's *Fuentes de la Historia española e Hispano-Americana* indicates the omission of numerous important Spanish titles. Also more than fifty publications are cited in the footnotes which are not listed in the formal bibliography. The use of the written accent on Spanish proper names is inconsistently applied. Reproductions of contemporary prints add to the value of the volume. This first work in English devoted to the Spanish republican movement is an excellent and meritorious contribution to the study of nineteenth century Spain.

Leonia, New Jersey. ROSCOE R. HILL.

An Undiplomatic Diary, by the American Member of the Inter-Allied Military Mission to Hungary, 1919–1920, Maj. Gen. Harry Hill Bandholtz, U. S. A. Edited by Fritz-Konrad Krüger, Professor of Political Science, Wittenberg College. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1933, pp. xxxi, 394, $3.50.) Professor Fritz-Konrad Krüger secured from the widow of General Bandholtz the permission to edit and publish his private diary, and contributed an introduction of seventeen pages, which is to describe the pre-war and post-war causes leading to the Hungarian downfall. Actually the introduction is a frank exposition of pro-Hungarian viewpoints, expressed, for example, as follows: "It seems to me that, in the light of these and other post-war disclosures, some rectifications of the incredibly harsh and dangerously foolish Peace Treaty of Trianon should be considered, in the interest

of Hungary and humanity" (p. xv). Furthermore, the editor is taking strong pot shots at the writers in the same field, who do not agree with his attitude (especially Dr. O. Jászi and Charles Vopička).

The diary itself can be considered valuable as a personal account of General Bandholtz, as his record of the events with which the Inter-Allied Military Mission to Hungary had to deal in 1919–1920. However, all his contacts with the Roumanians (who occupied Hungary at that time) seemed to have made him violently anti-Roumanian. We thus meet with statements of the following kind: "It is simply impossible to conceive such national depravity as those miserable 'Latins' of southeast Europe are displaying" (p. 220). Occasionally there are historical slips, which are corrected by the editor. A lot of space is taken up by the details of dinners, the attendance of social affairs, and the description of the social charms of the Hungarian leaders. Again, a typical example will serve: *"January 23, 1920.* Last night was the five-hundredth presentation of the popular Hungarian light opera 'János Vitéz', and about the four-hundredth appearance in it of their favorite actress, Fedák Sári. I received a complimentary box with an urgent invitation to attend, so I took the damned thing in" (p. 346).

In general, we have here a vast store of useful material, though the superfluous has not been eliminated. But its sarcasm frequently overshoots the mark and the diary, as well as its introduction, is written in a fine fury of indignation. As aggressive pro-Hungarian propaganda it must be taken with a pinch of salt, though both the editor and General Bandholtz are honest in their viewpoints. The result is a curious mixture which both stimulates and disappoints.

Centenary Junior College, Hackettstown. JOSEPH S. ROUCEK.

Clemenceau au soir de sa vie, 1920–1929. Par Général Mordacq. Deux tomes. (Paris, Librairie Plon, 1933, pp. vi, 300; 304; 15, 12 fr.) This two volume chronicle of the last days of Clemenceau's career, completing the author's previous study of the war minister, is one more proof that Clemenceau, like Bismarck, was one of those tragic figures whose genius rusted into mere misanthropy when the day of action had passed. General Mordacq makes out the best possible case for the last phase of his friend's career, maintaining that it was only the "sabotage of the Treaty of Versailles" and not personal disappointment over failing to get the rather empty honor of the French presidency that left him so querulous and embittered (II. 274). One may grant this and still stand appalled at the variety and virulence of his post-war enmities. Every attempt, in France or abroad, to modify or even to supplement the peace settlement of 1919 was deliberate treason to French safety. The Locarno Pact was merely "This new mutilation of the Treaty of Versailles " (II. 85); and the Briand-Kellogg Pact a "comedy" which would

only result in new concessions from France (II. 194). Lloyd George was an enemy of France and a man of "stupefying ignorance" (I. 257), Hoover was "completely in the hands of the German party in the United States" (I. 242), and Tardieu was the only man in French political life capable of carrying out a "truly French policy" (I. 166). At all events Clemenceau remained to the end an individual, and his prejudices are not always where one would expect to find them. He seems rather to have admired Wilson, the foreign pacifist, and to have detested Poincaré, fellow Frenchman and fellow nationalist.

The University of Michigan. PRESTON SLOSSON.

China's Foreign Relations, 1917–1931. By Robert T. Pollard, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Oriental Studies, University of Washington. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. x, 416, $3.50.) By reference to Dr. H. B. Morse's standard work, *The International Relations of the Chinese Empire,* Professor Pollard indicates his conception of the outstanding significance of the period covered by his study of China's foreign relations during the years 1917–1931. The earlier work subdivides the age of the Celestial Empire's relations with the West into three periods—those of conflict prior to 1860, of submission to 1894, and of subjection to 1911. With the entrance of China into the World War, followed shortly by the Bolshevist revolution in 1917, what Professor Pollard looks upon as the period of recovery begins, and he analyzes it with meticulous impartiality, carrying it down to the outbreak of hostilities between China and Japan in the autumn of 1931. Developments in the East during the past year and a half suggest to him the possibility that the period of recovery has been interrupted, if not ended, by a new one of conflict. Whatever the effect, to be traced by historians of the future, contemporary developments in that area can be comprehended only in the light of such detailed and scholarly studies as the one under consideration.

The thread which binds together the amazingly intricate series of incidents and conditions bearing upon China's foreign affairs during and since the World War is that of revision of old treaties and negotiation of new ones. The first dent in the foreign armor was effected as a consequence of the entry of China into the war in August, 1917. German and Austro-Hungarian political interests were liquidated. The course of the Russian revolution offered new opportunities to China. By 1918–1919, and somewhat steadily thereafter, the Soviet government was making overtures to both Peking and Canton, and a situation was developing not altogether dissimilar to that which had prevailed in 1895–1896 following disappointments experienced at the hands of Japan and Great Britain. By 1924 agreements with Germany and Russia had brought seventy-two per cent. of foreign white nationals in the country under the control of Chinese laws and courts.

The steps by which the privileged position of foreign nationals in China

has been undermined, the struggles of Japan to turn back, or at least to control the tide, and the position attained by the National government of China in 1931 are traced with care and buttressed with 1096 citations to—with few exceptions—irreproachable sources.

The author demonstrably belongs to the school of thought which looks upon history as purely scientific. Although writing in part from first-hand knowledge, he carefully suppresses that fact—as he does, with the rarest of exceptions, any tendency to let his natural humor play over the tragi-comedy which is China. He is all but superhumanly objective in his handling of materials and in his conclusions. Taking into account the narrow chronological limits of the study and the limitations of space for handling the domestic background of the foreign problems, the result is a weighty volume of real worth not to be taken up lightly nor soon to be forgotten.

The University of Chicago. HARLEY FARNSWORTH MACNAIR.

International Law in National Courts: a Study of the Enforcement of International Law in German, Swiss, French, and Belgian Courts. By Ruth D. Masters, Ph.D., Sometime Columbia University Fellow, Carnegie Fellow for International Law.

Compulsory Arbitration of International Disputes. By Helen May Cory, Sometime Gilder Fellow in Columbia University, lately Carnegie Fellow in International Law. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1932, pp. 245; xiii, 281, $3.75; $3.50.) Although the first of these volumes deals with the relation between international law and municipal law of states, the study is limited to the enforcement of international law in German, Swiss, French, and Belgian courts. It is not a study of the conflict of laws. As the position of international law in courts cannot be established by theories, the author discusses the practice of national judges in interpreting treaties. Of special significance is the critical survey, on the subject under discussion, of the treaties of Belgium from 1831 to 1919, and those of Germany, France, and Switzerland from 1791 to 1929. It is to be regretted that important cases of the last few years were not included. The book does not attempt to develop the historical phase of the subject, but is simply an invitation for a thorough historical study.

Miss Cory's work is a valuable contribution to the history of international arbitration. It is a study limited to the system of obligations whereby states have undertaken in advance to have recourse to arbitration for the settlement of their disputes. The device of a historical examination of compulsory arbitration has been employed. The early attempts at arbitration agreements of the Latin American countries, the first and second Pan-American conferences, the first and second Hague conferences, the Olney-Pauncefote treaty, and the Knox treaties are critically examined as milestones in the evolution

of obligatory arbitration. The value of the study is enhanced by the twenty-four page treaty index, with a tabular summary by states of compulsory arbitration engagements entered into during the period from 1820 to 1931.

American University. WILLIAM E. ARMSTRONG.

Benjamin Chew, 1722–1810, Head of the Pennsylvania Judiciary System under Colony and Commonwealth. By Burton Alva Konkle. (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1932, pp. xix, 316, $4.00.) It is a pleasure to welcome another volume from the pen of the veteran Pennsylvania biographer, Mr. Burton Alva Konkle, who already has to his credit lives of David Lloyd, George Bryan, Thomas Smith, Joseph Hopkinson, James Wilson, and Nicholas Biddle, as well as other studies in the field of Pennsylvania history. In his *Benjamin Chew,* in carefully tracing the relations of his subject to the government of the province and later of the state for a period of well over fifty years he has made an interesting and valuable contribution to the history of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Born in Maryland of Quaker parents, reared to manhood in the Lower Counties on the Delaware, where his father became chief justice, and finally establishing his residence in Pennsylvania, Chew played an influential rôle in shaping the destinies of the latter two provinces. The dual citizenship of the eighteenth century which permitted the Morris family to enjoy high office in both New York and New Jersey also permitted the accumulation of important posts in both Pennsylvania and Delaware by Benjamin Chew. Not only was he a member of the assembly of the Lower Counties and a compiler of its laws but for years he acted as its speaker. He was, also surprisingly enough, occupying the office of recorder of Philadelphia and that of attorney-general of Pennsylvania. Later he became a member of the governor's council in each of these colonies and in 1765 in surrendering the office of attorney-general, which for a decade he had filled with distinction, he succeeded to two of the most lucrative offices in the gift of the proprietors, that of register-general in both Pennsylvania and Delaware. To all these responsibilities and honors was added his appointment in 1774 as chief justice of Pennsylvania in place of William Allen. Although Loyalist in sympathy, he had conducted himself so circumspectly both in and out of office that he had few enemies when the Revolution broke upon America. Nevertheless, he and Governor Penn during the period of Howe's occupancy of Philadelphia were kept prisoners on parole in western New Jersey. Not until 1791 does Chew emerge from seclusion, when he accepted the appointment of president of the high court of errors and appeals of Pennsylvania which office he graced until the year 1805.

While by no means possessing a flowing style and while inclined to incorporate in the text materials customarily found in the footnotes or in appen-

dixes, Mr. Konkle has given to the public another solid contribution to historical scholarship. The work is handsomely illustrated.

Lehigh University. LAWRENCE H. GIPSON.

John Marshall in Diplomacy and in Law. By the Lord Craigmyle, formerly Lord Shaw of Dunfermline. With an Introduction by Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, New York. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933, pp. viii, 145, $1.75.) Lord Craigmyle presents here not a biography, not a work of research, nor yet a legal commentary, but a discriminating and vivid appreciation of Marshall's contribution to diplomacy and government. That law has its steadying contribution to society, and that nowhere is this contribution better realized than in Marshall, is the author's central conviction; it is also evident that the Hamilton-Washington-Marshall factor in American polity appeals more to him than that typified by a Jefferson or a Gerry. After a brief foreword by Dr. Butler the author analyzes the personal qualities of Marshall—their frontier origin, his military service, his "toughness in body and mind", his fondness for great authors, his patriotism, his amiability, his integrity, his notable affection for wife and children. Then he treats Marshall the diplomat outmaneuvering the pro-French camp in America and outfacing the wily Talleyrand in Paris; Marshall the jurist resisting Jeffersonian "politics to the death" in the trial of Burr (Beveridge being closely followed here); and Marshall the great chief justice laying those solidifying foundations without which the words "United States" would have been a "derisory term". The author brings to his task a pithy style, a poetic flair (as when he muses at the Lincoln Memorial, pp. 138–140), a keen legal (not legalistic) understanding, a friendly detachment, and a mind well furnished in incident and allusion. In fine, the book gives a cameo-like impression of the service of Marshall in restraining the flamboyant, impulsive type of liberty and promoting (see p. 23) the "American idea—practical, determined, undemonstrative, disciplined, the idea which you dare not despise when you call it English", a "harmonized liberty", the "correlative of order".

The University of Illinois. J. G. RANDALL.

Southwest on the Turquoise Trail: the First Diaries on the Road to Santa Fe. Edited, with Bibliographical Resumé, 1810–1825, by Archer Butler Hulbert. [Overland to the Pacific, volume II.] (Published by the Stewart Commission of Colorado College and the Denver Public Library, 1933, pp. xiv, 301, $5.00.) "The Turquoise Trail" is the editor's poetical designation of the long-familiar Santa Fe Trail, which, as he pertinently observes, did not really end at Santa Fe. The purpose of this second volume in the series is to present the story of the beginnings of the development of the great highway from

Missouri to the Southwest, "that track which, traversing Missouri and Kansas, crosses the Arkansas River and Cimarron Desert, gains Taos and Santa Fe, and throws its great arms out, one into Old Mexico by way of present El Paso and the other into California by way of the Mohave Desert and Salton Sea" (p. xiii). The method employed is to present significant documents, together with pertinent contemporary comment upon them, and an explanatory historical and bibliographical commentary by the present editor.

The volume is divided into two parts, the first pertaining to the trail to Santa Fe, the second to its extensions to Mexico and California. Necessarily, perhaps, the documents presented are of uneven length and significance. Those in Part I. begin with Pedro Vial's tour of 1792 to open the way from Spanish Santa Fe to Spanish St. Louis. Thomas Becknell's journey of 1821, reports of congressional inquiries instigated by Thomas H. Benton, the government survey of 1825–1827, the diary of General George C. Sibley for the same period, and Alphonso Wetmore's diary of 1828 follow.

Part II. contains but two selections, the second, or Mexican, half of Zebulon Pike's journal of 1806–1807, and Antonio Armijo's scanty record of his journey from Santa Fe to California in 1829–1830.

The editing of the volume is competently done, and the assembling of the documents presented is an undoubted service to scholarship. It is surely unfair to blame Lewis and Clark for subsequent eastern American ignorance of the West (p. 19); indeed, Mr. Hulbert himself testifies clamantly (especially in volume I. of the series) that this ignorance still continues. The name of so prominent a character as Robert Stuart should not be misspelled (pp. 7–9 and index). The footnote on page 8 indicates editorial ignorance of the existence, and ready availability since 1916 (*Wis. Hist. Colls.*, vol. XXII.), of Sergeant Ordway's journal, the only wholly complete one, of the Lewis and Clark expedition. A few minor errors in the nature of misprints, which we do not trouble to list, have been noted.

Detroit Public Library. M. M. Quaife.

The Emigrants' Guide to Oregon and California. By Lansford W. Hastings. With Historical Note and Bibliography by Charles Henry Carey.

Hall J. Kelley on Oregon. Edited by Fred Wilbur Powell.

Scenery of the Plains, Mountains, and Mines. By Franklin Langworthy. Edited by Paul C. Phillips from the Edition of 1855.

Scout and Ranger, being the Personal Adventures of James Pike of the Texas Rangers in 1859–60. With Introduction and Notes by Carl L. Cannon. [Narratives of the Trans-Mississippi Frontier, Carl L. Cannon, General Editor.] (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1932, pp. xxix, 157; xxi, 411; xviii, 292; xxii, 164, $3.00; $3.50; $3.50; $2.50). With the appearance of these four volumes the Princeton University Press has published eight in its

Narratives of the Trans-Mississippi Frontier series. The first editions of the writings under review appeared between the years 1832 and 1868. There are several editions of Hastings, *The Emigrants' Guide to Oregon and California,* but the first was published in 1845. Others appeared in 1847, 1848, and in 1857. The five selections and unpublished letters in *Hall J. Kelley on Oregon* span the entire period. Langworthy, *Scenery of the Plains, Mountains, and Mines* made its début in 1855, and the *Scout and Ranger* by James Pike was published in 1865.

Hastings's *Guide* contains a good historical introduction to the text, a bibliography on Hastings, "Crawford's Notes upon the Text", and an "Appraisal of the Hastings Book" taken from Bancroft's *History of California,* which could be more appropriately entitled "An Arraignment of Hastings' Veracity". The text is a facsimile of the 1845 edition, so there are no editorial notes pointing out the inaccuracies of the text. The selections from Hall Jackson Kelley contain materials the character of which might well have been selected by Bancroft to justify his contention that Kelley did not "Cease writing and raving" on Oregon until he reached the ripe age of eighty-five. They also reveal the tender sensitiveness of the author. After all, perhaps the increasing periods of contemplation to which he occasionally refers were principally unhappy intervals that he spent nursing grievances, some of which were imaginary and others the result of his own mistaken judgment.

Langworthy, *Scenery of the Plains, Mountains, and Mines* is the most interesting and valuable of the series under review. The author belongs to that very small group of well-trained, cultured, and intelligent men who have lived in the midst of the primitive hardships of a frontier environment and have left first-hand, impersonal accounts of conditions there. James Pike, *Scout and Ranger,* is presented in expurgated form. The original edition falls naturally into two parts. The first relates the author's experiences as a Texas ranger just prior to the Civil War, and the second records his services as a spy in the Union army during and after that conflict. The former is selected, appropriately, for this series. James Pike, a grandnephew of Zebulon Montgomery Pike, was a sturdy, rugged frontier character who possessed the unusual knack of relating his experiences without conspicuously magnifying the personal qualities associated with the incidents described.

The format of the volumes is up to the high standard set by the Princeton University Press from the beginning. While the editorial work has not been as thorough as it was in the first four volumes of the series, the principal object of the editors and of the publisher has been achieved. Students and readers of Western history may now have easy access to books which formerly could be obtained only, if at all, in a few of the larger libraries of the country.

Mills College. CARDINAL GOODWIN.

Lincoln: a Psycho-Biography. By L. Pierce Clark. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933, pp. xv, 570, $3.50.) The author of this curious volume does not condescend to document any of his statements. In 550 pages not a single sustaining note. For him with his assumptions as to how biography may be written, none are needed. Briefly his formula is—I see a type; I recognize and classify it; data that fit into my conception of this type are to be accepted as reliable; don't ask me for my authorities any more than you would ask the priestess at Delphi. All very good for Delphi! But commonplace people, mere historians and the like, find here a welter of facts, anecdotes, myths, impressions, all selected and unified by a preconception. In a word, we have a literary effect instead of a historical one. The method is exactly the method of the novelist. But this method is used in the interests of psychoanalysis. Waiving one's personal attitude toward that highly dogmatic science, the mere historian deplores its failure to differentiate between treatise and biography. Much of this volume is treatise pure and simple, with Lincoln as a peg to hang dogmas upon. This is not the place to discuss the linguistic propriety of "mother fixation" or the anthropological soundness of "the Euripidean complex". If those ideas appeal to you, you will find them here applied to Lincoln with all the infectious zeal of a propagandist. But you must forgive the historian for resenting the author's omniscience—the very thing we accept in the novelist—and for his objections to regarding Delphi as a graduate school of historical research.

N. W. S.

John McLean's Notes of a Twenty-Five Years' Service in the Hudson's Bay Territory. Edited by W. S. Wallace. [Publications of the Champlain Society, volume XIX.] (Toronto, the Society, 1932, pp. xxxvi, 402.) This fur trade narrative was originally published in 1849 and is now a collector's item. The author was an employee of the Hudson's Bay Company from 1820 to 1845 and the book is devoted to his experiences and reflections. The Hudson's Bay Company when the volume opens was still at war with the North West Company, and the book in its early chapters is an intimate account of cutthroat competition in the Ottawa Valley where the author was stationed. The scene shifts in 1833 from the East to New Caledonia, and in 1837 to Labrador. In Labrador the author discovered the Great Falls of Labrador, the chief claim he has to fame. His fur trade services terminated at Great Slave Lake in 1845. He quit the company in a huff, and his narrative, published four years later, is intended as an exposé of the company's evil ways. The account is warped in this respect by feeling. The author advocates the abolition of the company's charter and the restoration of free competition in the fur trade as in the interests of the Indians! The work is considered by its editor "a document of first-rate importance for the history

of the fur trade" (p. xxi). This may be doubted, but it is, perhaps, useful enough to have warranted a new edition. A good sketch of McLean opens the volume. The editorial work throughout is excellent.

Harvard University. FREDERICK MERK.

Historical Evolution of Hispanic America. By J. Fred Rippy, Professor of History, Duke University. (New York, F. S. Crofts and Company, 1932, pp. xvii, 580, $5.00.) Of the several methods of treatment adopted hitherto by writers on the subject the author has chosen mainly the one that examines the course of national development from the standpoint of successive tendencies and movements more or less characteristic of the Hispanic-American countries as a whole. From it he deviates to the extent of assigning nearly two-fifths of the text to international relations alone. Condensed from his larger work on the theme, this section discusses, not so much the foreign policies of the countries themselves, as what European nations and the United States have done or thought about them. It is easily the best portion of a volume in many ways commendable.

Intensive study of the contents, however, convinces the reviewer that Professor Rippy has written more hurriedly than his ample knowledge justifies. When handling material still relatively strange to American college teachers and students little can be taken for granted and correspondingly greater care must be exercised for the assurance of accuracy in presentation. The comments that follow, accordingly, are offered as suggestions of some respects in which the results of apparent haste may be avoided in a subsequent edition.

Compression of the colonial and revolutionary period to the advantage of "international relations" is a questionable arrangement. So are the insertion of the names of multifarious personages and narration by means of presidential administrations. Spanish terms are not always defined or else are curiously anglicized. Nowhere emerges an adequate account of the influence of geography, climate, the aboriginal inhabitants, and European immigration, upon the evolution of national character and custom. The author's attitude toward Spanish colonial rule is rather hypercritical. It certainly has prevented him from giving appropriate recognition to the work of the Church. Assuredly the "Age of the Dictators" did not continue up to 1932. "Yankee" as an equivalent for "American" or "North American" seems quite inadmissible. Nor is "Anglo-American" a term properly applicable to the presumptive "dominance" of the United States.

The Casa de la Contratación was not a "board of trade" (p. 58). Periodicals appeared in Spanish America long before 1801 (p. 112). That Bolívar "penetrated the hidden mysteries of his epoch" (p. 158) is dubious. Western Haiti did not threaten to secede from eastern (p. 166), any more than Spain entered

the American Revolution "on the side of the United States" (p. 343) or than Colombia had a boundary dispute with Nicaragua (p. 487).

Though the author did not wish to present an "extensive bibliography", he furnishes upwards of four hundred titles. Among eighteen items mentioned under "General Histories" he stars fourteen as possessing the "greatest value". A chronological list of Hispanic-American viceroys, captains general, presidents, constitutions, and independence days would have been serviceable. The index manifestly is not the compilation of an expert.

Columbia University. WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Program Committee of the American Historical Association is developing plans for the Urbana meeting (December 27, 28, 29) along the lines announced in the last number of this journal. The general session on the Transit of Civilization will emphasize the phases indicated by the title, "The Transit of Civilization in the Middle West". Further topics have been arranged for the sectional or research groups. For example, Russian History, Historiography, Immigration, and American Legal History and Records. In addition to the joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, which is to discuss the topic "The Old Northwest", there will be sessions of the Agricultural History Society, the American Society of Church History, the Conference of Historical Societies, and the National Council of Social Sciences.

Two committees of the Association with important projects of publication report gratifying progress. For the Littleton-Griswold Committee the *Records of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, 1695–1729,* edited by Carroll T. Bond, chief judge of the Maryland court of appeals, is in press (Plimpton Press). Two other volumes planned by this committee are in preparation: *Selections from the Records of the Mayoralty Court of New York City,* edited by Dr. Richard B. Morris; *Records of the Vice-Admiralty Court of Rhode Island,* edited by Dorothy S. Towle, with an introduction by Professor Charles M. Andrews.

Mrs. Frank T. Griswold, who endowed the Littleton-Griswold Fund, has generously offered to supplement the income from her endowment by a substantial sum in order to hasten the publication of all three of these volumes.

For the Beveridge Fund Committee, *The Weld Papers* (of Theodore D. Weld, Sarah Grimké, and Angelina Grimké Weld), edited by Professor Gilbert H. Barnes and Professor Dwight L. Dumond, will go to press early in the autumn. They will fill two volumes and contain vivid anti-slavery material.

The Bibliography of British History: Tudor Period, 1483–1603, issued under the direction of the American Historical Association and the Royal Historical Society of Great Britain, has been published by the Clarendon Press (New York, Oxford University Press, pp. 467, $8.50). The editor is Dr. Conyers Read. A preface, describing the aim and scope of this work, has been contributed by Professor E. P. Cheyney, chairman of the Committee

on the Bibliography of Modern British History. A previous volume had already been issued, dealing with the Stuart period and edited by Mr. Godfrey Davies. A volume on the Eighteenth Century (covering the period 1715–1789) is in course of preparation, under the editorship of Professor D. J. Medley.

TRANSFER TO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE OF THE OLDER ARCHIVES OF CERTAIN AMERICAN EMBASSIES, LEGATIONS, AND CONSULATES

At various dates in 1932, the Department of State issued instructions addressed to American diplomatic and consular officers, calling for the transfer to the Department of State of all records and archives prior to January 1, 1907, of the diplomatic and consular posts to which they were addressed. Up to July 24, 6177 volumes of records and archives had been received by the department, and the transfer is practically complete.

The material transmitted from the various embassies and legations consists principally of instructions from and dispatches to the Department of State, notes to and from the foreign office of the country in which the diplomatic post is located, correspondence to and from the American consular posts in that country, miscellaneous correspondence, records of passports issued, registers of American citizens, and correspondence relative to claims of American citizens.

The material transmitted from the consular posts consists principally of the following: records of fees and accounts, records of seamen relieved, seamen's registers, records of services to American vessels, registers of landing and debenture certificates, records of the arrival and departure of American vessels, papers relating to accounts and returns, marine notes of protest, marine extended protests, ships' daily journals, registration applications of American citizens, marriage, birth, and death certificates, alien visa applications, invoice books, miscellaneous correspondence books, and volumes containing the instructions and dispatches passing between the Department of State and the consular posts.

Many of the records and archives received are in a very bad state of preservation, due largely to climatic conditions in the tropical regions in which they were kept, and to destruction caused by tropical insects and worms. Approximately half of the records received have been fumigated by the archives staff of the department, with a view to preventing further destruction.

The following brief notations will serve to indicate the countries from which records and archives have been received, and the periods which the records cover.

Brazil: The diplomatic records date from the year 1809, and some of the consular records from the year 1819.

COLOMBIA: The diplomatic and consular records date from the year 1823.

COSTA RICA: The diplomatic records date from the year 1854, and contain many records relative to other Central American republics. Some of the consular records date from the year 1882.

CUBA: Some of the consular records date from the year 1820. The embassy at Havana was authorized to retain its old records and archives.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: The diplomatic records date from the year 1883, and some of the consular records from the year 1847.

ECUADOR: The diplomatic records date from the year 1827, and some of the consular records from the year 1835.

GUATEMALA: The diplomatic records relative to Guatemala date from the year 1821, and the consular records from the year 1825. The legation archives also contain material relative to other Central American republics, some of which dates from the year 1812.

HAITI: The diplomatic records date from the year 1860, and some of the consular records from the year 1849.

HONDURAS: The diplomatic records date from the year 1854, and some of the consular records from the year 1872.

NICARAGUA: Some of the consular records date from the year 1854. The legation at Managua was authorized to retain its old records and archives.

PANAMA: Some of the consular records date from the year 1833. The legation at Panama was authorized to retain its records and archives.

EL SALVADOR: The diplomatic records date from the year 1856, and some of the consular records from the year 1862.

VENEZUELA: The diplomatic records date from the year 1835, and some of the consular records from the year 1824.

BRITISH POSSESSIONS IN AND ADJACENT TO THE WEST INDIES: Records and archives dating from the years indicated have been received from the following consular posts: Barbados, 1842; Roseau, Dominica, 1880; Belize, British Honduras, 1892; Georgetown, British Guiana, 1858; Kingston, Jamaica, 1831; Nassau, N. P., Bahamas, 1821; Trinidad, B. W. I., 1855; Hamilton, Bermuda, 1854; and St. George's, Bermuda, 1878.

FRENCH POSSESSIONS IN THE WEST INDIES: Records and archives dating from the year 1871 have been received from Martinique, French West Indies.

NETHERLANDS, POSSESSIONS IN THE WEST INDIES: Records and archives dating from the year 1821 have been received from Curaçao, Netherlands, West Indies.

OTHER PLACES: Records and archives have been received from former American consular agencies: Larnaca, Cyprus (for the period 1919–1930); Haifa, Palestine (1872–1917); Jaffa, Palestine (1866–1917).

H. M.

PERSONAL

Amos Shartle Hershey, professor of history in Indiana University, died on June 12 at the age of 65. He was a member of the class of 1892 at Harvard, and completed his work for the doctorate at Heidelberg in 1894. His work as a teacher in Indiana University began the following year. He was made professor of European history and politics in 1900, and became head of the newly created department of political science in 1914. His principal writings were *The International Law and Diplomacy of the Russo-Japanese War* (1907), and *The Essentials of International Law and Organization* (1927).

Philip Alexander Bruce, historian of Virginia, died on August 16 at the age of 77. He was graduated from the University of Virginia in the class of 1876, taking a law degree from Harvard three years later. His first book was *The Plantation Negro as a Freeman* (1888). Among his later works were *Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, 2 vols. (1895), and *Social Life of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, 2 vols. (1910). His latest work was *The Virginia Plutarch*, in two volumes, published by the University of Virginia (1929).

Paul van Dyke, for many years professor of Modern history in Princeton University, died on August 30 at the age of 74. He graduated from Princeton with the class of 1881 and from the Princeton Theological Seminary three years later. The following year he studied in the University of Berlin. He served in two pastorates, and was for three years instructor in Church history in Princeton Seminary. In 1892 he became professor of Modern European history in the university, and held that position until his recent retirement. He was twice Harvard lecturer to the provincial universities of France, and was Louis Liard lecturer at the Sorbonne. His most notable work as a writer was his biography of *Catherine de Medicis* in two volumes (1922). Among his other works were *The Age of the Renascence* (1897), *Renascence Portraits* (1905), and *The Story of France* (1928). He was a valued contributor to this journal, his most recent review appearing in the July number.

Henry Walcott Farnam, long professor of economics in Yale University, died on September 5 at the age of 79. He was a member of the class of 1874 at Yale, and studied in Berlin, Göttingen, and Strasbourg, receiving the doctorate in 1878. After two years as a tutor in Yale College he was appointed professor of economics. He retired in 1918. His writings were chiefly in the field of economics. To the *Festgabe* offered to Professor Schmoller in 1908 he contributed Deutsch-Amerikanische Beziehungen in der Volkswirtschaftsleben. He early joined the American Historical Association, was a life member, and a generous friend.

Thomas Rice Edward Holmes, the distinguished authority on Julius Caesar, died on August 6 at the age of 78. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, and from 1878 until his retirement in 1909 taught in the great English public schools, including St. Paul's. Among his notable works are *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* (2nd ed., 1911); *Ancient Britain and the Invasions of Julius Caesar* (1907); *Caesar's Commentaries on the Gallic War,* translated (1908); *The Roman Republic and the Formation of the Empire,* 3 vols. (1923); *The Architect of the Roman Empire,* 2 vols. (1928, 1931). He was also an authority on the Indian Mutiny and wrote a volume upon that subject which reached a fifth edition in 1898. He contributed a chapter on the Mutiny in the *Cambridge History of India,* vol. VI., reviewed on another page of this journal.

Charles Andler, the successor of Arthur Chuquet as professor of the Germanic language and literature in the Collège de France, died on April 1 at the age of 67. Like Chuquet he will be remembered as a historian quite as much as a student of literature. One of his earlier works was *Les origines du socialisme d'État en Allemagne.* Two years before the World War he published *Le socialisme impérialiste dans l'Allemagne.* He also wrote a widely read life of *Le prince de Bismarck* (1899). During the war he edited four volumes of selections from German writings to illustrate Pan-Germanism in all its phases. His prefaces to these volumes, if put together, would amount to a volume of 400 pages. In his later life his great work was a study of Nietzsche in six volumes.

Another recent death of a distinguished French historian was that of Christian Pfister associated with Charles Bémont as editor of the *Revue historique* for volumes CX. to CXVI. After France recovered Alsace, M. Pfister became professor, then dean, and finally rector of the University of Strasbourg. One of his early works was *Études sur le règne de Robert le Pieux* (1885). He also published a *Histoire de Nancy,* 3 vols. (1902–1909).

In the late June number of the *Historische Zeitschrift* Professor Karl Stählin gives his impressions of the work of two distinguished Russian historians who recently died in exile, Serge F. Platonov and Alexander A. Kizevetter.

Twenty-nine scholars, of his own and other nations, have joined in honoring the sixtieth birthday of Professor Halvdan Koht of Oslo, president of the International Committee of Historical Sciences, by a handsome volume of historical studies, *Festskrift til Halvdan Koht på Seksiårsdagen, 7de Juli 1933* (Oslo, Aschehoug, pp. 360). Twenty of the studies are in Norwegian, mostly on subjects in Scandinavian history, four in German, four in French, one in English, the last an interesting paper by Mr. Harold Temperley on British Secret Diplomacy during the Palmerstonian Period. Special attention

may also be called to M. Michel Lhéritier's essay on Histoire et causalité, that of Eiliv Skard on the Roman title of Pater Patriae, that of Professor Henri Pirenne on the treasury and finances of the Merovingian kings, and that of Arnold Ræstad on the question of the jurisdiction of Norwegian kings over Greenland. J. F. J.

At the opening of the Seventh International Congress on History at Warsaw on August 21 there were more than a thousand delegates from forty countries. The following Americans were present: Salo Baron, Beverley W. Bond, jr., Isaac J. Cox, Fred Morrow Fling, Louis R. Gottschalk, and Michael I. Rostovtzeff.

Dr. Curtis W. Garrison, of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, has accepted the position of archivist in the State Library of Pennsylvania at Harrisburg.

Professor A. T. Volwiler, of Wittenberg College, has accepted the position of associate professor of history in Ohio University, and has already begun his work at that institution.

Professor Oscar J. Campbell, of the University of Michigan, has been appointed visiting scholar at the Huntington Library, to be in residence for six months beginning on February 1, 1934.

Jarvis M. Morse, Brown University, has been promoted to the rank of assistant professor.

Leaves of absence for the year 1933–1934; Frank Nowak, *Boston University,* for the first semester; Clarence H. Haring, *Harvard University,* for the second semester, A. M. Schlesinger, for the year.

GENERAL

General review: Ch. Guignebert, *Histoire des religions: Christianisme antique; Histoire du Christianisme: Temps moderne et contemporaine* (Rev. Hist., May[1]); George Espinas, *Histoire urbaine: Directions de recherches et résultats* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc., May, July); Lucien Febvre, *De l'histoire-tableau: Essais de critique constructive* (*ibid.*).

The American Council of Learned Societies offers for the year 1934 grants in aid of research, the smaller not exceeding $300, the larger not exceeding $1000, and post-doctoral fellowships, with a basic stipend of $1800. Applications must be filed at Washington, D. C., the office of the Council, 907 Fifteenth St., N. W., by December 15, and awards will be announced in March, 1934.

[1] Articles mentioned in this and the following sections have appeared since October, 1932. Books mentioned were published in 1933, unless another date is given.

The *Bulletin* of the International Committee of Historical Sciences for May continues the publication of papers or reports submitted to the International Congress of Warsaw.

Fritz Kern, the author of *Die Anfänge der Weltgeschichte, ein Forschungsbericht und Leitfaden* (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, pp. 149, 4 M.), takes Menghin's *Weltgeschichte der Steinzeit* as his text and never wanders very far from it. The treatment is philosophical, the end in view synthetic. He makes use of the terminology first employed by Rellini and Menghin. His Alithic and Eolithic are followed by Protolithic (Lower Paleolithic), Miolithic (Upper Paleolithic), Epimiolithic (Mesolithic), Protoneolithic, Mixoneolithic, and Epineolithic. There is no index to the little volume and the text is without illustrations. G. G. M.

Three pamphlets may be noted which have been published in advance from the *Proceedings* of the British Academy (London, Humphrey Milford). Archaeology and Folk Tradition, by H. J. Fleure (Sir John Rhŷs Memorial Lecture) shows by many interesting examples, from the Baltic regions, from Ireland, and from Britain, how often modern archæological researches have shown popular traditions to have a basis of historic fact. C. J. Gadd of the British Museum, Seals of Ancient Indian Style found at Ur, adds to the evidence for connection in the third millennium B. C. between the civilizations of the Indus valley and of Mesopotamia. A. W. Clapham discourses instructively on the Renaissance of Architecture and Stone-Carving in Southern France in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries. J. F. J.

The Faculty of Arts of the University of Egypt began in May the publication of a *Bulletin,* which is to appear twice a year. The honorary secretary of the editorial board is Mr. Shafik Ghorbal. Among the articles of interest in this number are: An Early Arabic Translation from the Greek, entitled The Book of the Plants of Aristotle, one version of a work included in the Corpus of Aristotle, by A. J. Arberry; D'un pont de fer à la Mecque dans une chanson de geste du XIV^e^ siècle, by Herman Dopp; The Mamluk Conquest of Cyprus in the Fifteenth Century, by Mustafa Ziada; The Missions of Ali Effendi in Paris and of Sedki Effendi in London, 1797–1811, a Contribution to the Study of the Westernization of Ottoman Institutions, by Shafik Ghorbal.

At the May meeting of the Lakeville (Conn.) Historical Conference it was decided to adopt a definite program looking toward the establishment of a system of exchange professorships among the member colleges with possible extensions to other academic institutions. Information concerning the project may be obtained from the president, Miss Viola F. Barnes, Mount Holyoke College. A list of members willing to consider exchange appointments, with data as to training, experience, field, geographical preference, salary, etc.,

is now in the hands of the secretary, Miss Elsie DeWitt, Wellesley College, and may be consulted by heads of departments interested.

Articles: Jacques Delevsky, *Nature et histoire* (Rev. Synthèse, June); Paul Langevin, *La valeur éducative de l'histoire des sciences* (*ibid.*); H. J. Fleure, *Racial Distribution in the Light of Archæology* (Bull. John Rylands Library, July); Howard F. Barker, *Surnames as Common Property* (Am. Mercury, Sept.); H. P. Mead, *The Story of the Semaphore* (Mariner's Mirror, July).

ANCIENT HISTORY

The following reports of excavations are significant: E. Dhorme, on the work at Ras Shamra (*Jour. Savants,* Jan.); Ausgrabungen in Sichem (*Arch. Anzeig.,* XLVII. 289 ff.); articles on American excavations at Athens, by Leslie Shear and Homer Thompson (*Am. Jour. Arch.,* Apr.); also one by G. E. Mylonas and K. Kourouniotes on the new work at Eleusis (*ibid.*); several important hoards of early Roman coins published in *Notizie delgi scavi* (VIII. 393 ff.); T. Ashby (an article found among his manuscripts) on Discoveries in Italy and the Mediterranean (*Jour. Rom. Stud.,* XXIII., no. 1). The *Archaeologischer Anzeiger* has a full summary of finds in Italy during 1932 (XLVII. 447 ff.). New bibliographies are available in the *Archiv für Orientforschung* (no. 6) and in the *American Journal of Archaeology* (Apr.).

Die ältere Chronologie Babyloniens, Assyriens, und Ægyptens, von Eduard Meyer (Stuttgart, J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1931, pp. viii, 74, 3 M.) recalls the mingled pleasure and regret at the posthumous publication of Meyer's last partial revision of his *Geschichte des Altertums.* The regret will be greater that this chronological appendix has been republished virtually without change, save for five pages of *Ergänzungen* by the editor. The republication at least testifies to the sanity of Meyer, for to-day there is little support for the rival Egyptian chronology here combatted and his date of 2049–1750 for the First Dynasty of Babylon, key date of all early West Asiatic history, is now accepted by the majority of students. A. T. O.

M. Jacques Pirenne's *Histoire des institutions et du droit privé de l'ancienne Égypte* (Brussels, Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth) is an important contribution by one who, trained primarily in the history of law, has proceeded to master the relevant Egyptian texts.

The new edition of the *Prosopographia imperii Romani,* so eagerly awaited, is not far off. Groag and Stein have now edited the first volume (A-B) for the Prussian Academy. The increase in bulk will apparently be 50 per cent. or over.

Since some new materials of importance concerning the Emperor Claudius have recently come to light, it was well to attempt a revision of the

record. Arnaldo Momigliano's monograph which he calls *L'opera dell' imperatore Claudio* (Vallecchi, Florence, 1932) does not pretend to be a complete biography; one wishes it were, for it shows sound knowledge and keen insight. The author overemphasizes, perhaps, the Augustan tradition in Claudius's work, in contrast to former writers who have dwelt more on the Claudian borrowings from Julius Caesar's program. The demonstration of what Claudius accomplished by way of centralizing control and of weakening the senate's power in the government is the most valuable part of the study.

The second report—as valuable as the first—of what the University of Michigan Expedition found at Karanis in 1924–1931 has arrived. This volume is devoted mainly to the temples and the coin hoards.

The fourth report of the excavations at Dura-Europos has valuable papers on the architecture, the inscriptions, the pictures (including graffiti), and a report on finds. A. R. Bellinger gives a summary of the new material for the history of Dura.

The Johns Hopkins Press has recently issued volumes V. and VI. of Robinson's *Excavations at Olynthus* (Mosaics, Vases, Lamps, Coins), also the first volume of the *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* which is being written by ten specialists and edited by Tenney Frank.

Those interested in Etruscan culture should not miss the announcement of two amazing terra cotta statues (provenience not given) in the *Bulletin* of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1933, page 30.

W. Kroll has written several well-packed essays on the politics and economics of the Ciceronian period, which are published under the title *Die Kultur der Ciceronischen Zeit* (*Das Erbe der Alten,* XXII., Leipzig). A second volume dealing with cultural and social topics is promised for early publication.

Articles: W. A. Heidel, *A Suggestion concerning Plato's Atlantis* (Proc. Am. Ac. Arts and Sciences, May); H. Nesselhauf, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der delisch-attischen Symmachie* (Klio, Beih. 30); R. Taubenschlag, *Afterpacht und Aftermiete im Rechte der Papyri* (Zeit. Sav. Stift., LIII., Rom. Abt.); W. L. Westermann, *Slave Transfer: Deed of Sale* (Aegyptus, Jan.); A. E. R. Boak, *Loan of 74 B. C.* (*ibid.*); A. M. Gomme, *A Forgotten Factor in Greek Naval Strategy* (Jour. Hell. Stud., LIII., no. 1); W. W. Tarn, *Two Notes on Ptolemaic History* (*ibid.*); M. Holleaux, *L'élection au consulat de P. Sulpicius* (Bull. Corr. Hell., LVI., no. 2); M. I. Rostovtzeff, *L'Hellénisme en Mesopotamie* (Scientia, LIV., no. 1); A. Klotz, *Die römische Wehrmacht im 2. punischen Kriege* (Philol., LXXXVIII., no. 1); M. Gelzer, *Römische Politik bei Fabius Pictor* (Hermes, LXII., no.

2); R. Syme, *Some Notes on the Legions under Augustus* (Jour. Rom. Stud., XXIII., no. 1); H. S. Schultz, *The Roman Evacuation of Britain* (*ibid.*); E. Ciccotti, *Il problema religioso nel mondo antico* (N. Riv. Stor., Jan.); W. W. Buckland, *Casus and Frustration in Roman and Common Law* (Harvard Law Rev., June); E. Levy, *Von dem römischen Anklagervergehen* (Zeit. Sav. Stift., LIII., Rom. Abt.).

T. F.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Progress of Medieval Studies in the United States and Canada, Bulletin No. 11 has recently been issued by Professor James F. Willard. As a measure of economy the Bulletin will, for the immediate future, be issued biennially instead of annually. This issue contains notes of papers presented at meetings of learned societies during 1932, books published and forthcoming books of interest to medievalists, a list of medievalists and their publications during the year 1932, a list of doctoral dissertations in progress or completed, and several obituaries.

After a lapse of many years the great series of *Jahrbücher der deutschen Geschichte* has been resumed with the appearance of Alfred Hessel's volume upon Albrecht I. of Hapsburg (Munich, 1931). The work marks a point of departure in two senses. As originally planned this series was to conclude in 1250. Apparently it is now projected to continue the series through the reign of Frederick III., if not Maximilian. Moreover, the present volume inaugurates a new method. The chronological order is less rigorously observed and the expository treatment is of a more topical nature. More space is given to critical discussion and less to mere references, which are reduced to a minimum. On the other hand citations from sources are often given at length. It is to be hoped, however, that the Munich Academy, which has sponsored this series since 1862, while having in view this extension of the *Jahrbücher* to the end of the fifteenth century, will not lose sight of the fact that there are still two large gaps in the series before 1250. The severest criticism of German medieval scholarship, perhaps, which can be made is that only one volume of *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reichs unter Friedrich I., 1152–1158*—that by Simonsfeld (1908)—has yet been published. Thirty years of Barbarossa's reign yet remain to be exhaustively studied. Similarly Winkelmann's two volumes upon Frederick II. (1889, 1897) extend only to 1233.

J. W. T.

The Middle Ages—Romantic or Rationalistic? by J. S. P. Tatlock, and Economic Rationalism in the late Middle Ages, by N. S. B. Gras, two addresses read at the April meeting of the Mediaeval Academy of America, are published in *Speculum* for July. A Project for a New Edition of Vincent of Beauvais, by B. L. Ullman, Butchering in Mediaeval London, by E. L.

Sabine, The *Georgica Spiritualia* of John of Garland, by E. Faye Wilson, and Genoese Trade with Northwest Africa in the Twelfth Century, by H. C. Krueger are also published in the same issue.

In vol. XXIV. of *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* of the Prussian Historical Institute in Rome are, among others, the following studies: Zur Geschichte der Bistumsorganisation Campaniens und Apuliens im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert, by Hans Walter Klewitz; Piacenzas Beziehungen zu Barbarossa, by Ferdinand Güterbock; Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte des päpstlichen Finanzwesens um die Wende des 13. Jahrhunderts, by Friedrich Baethgen; Beiträge zur kurialen Verwaltungsgeschichte im 14. Jahrhundert, by Gerd Tellenbach; and Die Erforschung der päpstlichen Nuntiaturen, by Leo Just.

Professor Karl Young of Yale University is the author of *The Drama of the Medieval Church* (Oxford University Press, pp. 1350, with many plates, $17.50), which brings together the dramatic compositions used as a part of public worship, some of the texts never having been printed before.

Articles: J. Zeiller, *La conception de l'Église aux quatre premiers siècles* [I.] (Rev. Hist. Ecclés., July); Carl Schmidt, *Neue Originalquellen des Manichäismus aus Ægypten* (Zeit. Kirchengesch., LII., no. 1); Paulus Peeters, *Jérémie, évêque de l'Ibérie perse* (An. Boll., LI., nos. 1, 2); Hippolyte Delehaye, *Recherches sur le légendier romain* (*ibid.*); Maurice Coens, *La légende de S. Audebert, comte d'Ostrevant* (*ibid.*); Paul Grosjean, *Le martyrologe de Tallaght* (*ibid.*); F. Van Steenberghen, *La philosophie de S. Augustin d'après les travaux du centenaire* (Rev. Néo-Scolastique Philos., May); Germain Morin, *Une fête romaine éphémère du V^e^ siècle: L'anniversaire de la prise de Rome par Alaric* (Hist. Jahrb., LIII., no. 1); Wolfram von den Steinen, *Chlowdigs Taufe: Tours 507?* (Hist. Jahrb., LIII., no. 1); C. Barbagallo, *Il colpo di stato del Natale dell'800* (N. Riv. Stor., Jan.); S. Hellmann, *Die Vita Heinrici IV. und die Kaiserliche Kanzlei* (Hist. Vierteljahr., July); Ernst Benz, *Die Geschichtstheologie der Franziskanerspiritualen des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts nach neuen Quellen* (Zeit. Kirchengesch., LII., no. 1); Louis Jarraux, *Pierre Jean Olivi, sa vie, sa doctrine* (Études Francis., Mar.); H. Matrod, *Les premiers temps de l'Éthiopie franciscaine* (*ibid.*); John G. Gruber, *The Peace Negotiations of the Avignon Popes* (Cath. Hist. Rev., July); L. de Lacger, *L'Albigeois pendant la crise de l'Albigéisme* [II.] (Rev. Hist. Ecclés., July); Robert Barroux, *Un projet français de fédération européenne sous Philippe le Bel: Pierre Dubois et la paix perpétuelle* (Rev. Hist. Dipl., XLVII., no. 2); U. Gualazzini, *Per la storia dei rapporti tra Enrico III e Bonifacio di Canossa* (Arch. Stor. Ital., XIX., no. 1); A. Birkenmajer, *Découverte de fragments manuscrits de David de Dinant* (Rev. Néo-Scolastique Philos., May); H. Caplan, *"Henry of Hesse" On the Art of Preach-*

ing (Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc., June); E. F. Jacob, *Florida verborum venustas: Some early Examples of Euphuism in England* (Bull. John Rylands Library, July); H. Pirenne, *Un grand commerce d'exportation au Moyen Age: Les vins de France* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc., May); D. Monnoyeur, *Un fragment nouveau en faveur de Gerson* (Études Francis., Mar.); D. J. Othon, *Les origines cisterciennes* (Rev. Mabillon, Jan.).

G. C. B.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

General review: Augusto Torre, *Le origini della guerra mondiale* (N. Riv. Stor., Jan.).

The textbook entitled *Europe since 1500* (Holt, pp. xiv, 618, $2.90), by Hastings Eells, professor of history in Ohio Wesleyan University, has the merit of being written with the needs of the student definitely in mind. The author has avoided the error of trying to pack within brief compass the maximum number of facts and dates. Of course, each teacher thinking mainly of his favorite period will discover omissions or statements so incomplete as to seem erroneous. One feature especially to be commended is the plan of the maps, each map recording only the names prominent in the text. It would be an advantage, however, if there were one map, at least, exhibiting a small region, the neighborhood of Paris, for example, on a larger scale, to correct the natural impressions conveyed by so many maps Europe-wide in extent.

The Renaissance popes, Alexander VI. to Paul III., were on the whole friendly to the Jews. In spite of a reaction during the Catholic Reformation (notably under the fanatical Paul IV. and Pius V.), Sixtus V. (1585–1590) who was gifted with economic skill, renewed their privileges, a policy followed by his successors. By these means the Papal States were saved from the financial ruin which befell the Kingdom of Naples, where an anti-Semitic attitude was adopted. These and other matters of interest are developed by Ermanno Loevinson, director of the royal archives in Bologna, who on the basis of three papal registers (1587–1669) has made a study entitled *La concession de banques de prêts aux Juifs par les papes des seizième et dix-septième siècles: Contribution à l'histoire des finances d'Italie* (Paris, Elias, 1932).

Die Entstehung und Entwicklung der ständigen diplomatischen Vertretung Brandenburg-Preussens am Carenhofe bis zum Eintritt Russlands in die Reihe der europäischen Grossmächte, by Josef Krusche (Breslau, Priebatsch Buchhandlung, n. d., pp. 78), is a reprint from *Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven.* It is based almost entirely on the Prussian archives and publications in the German language. Nevertheless its value is quite outstanding, because it paints a very accurate picture of the state of diplomacy in the seventeenth century with particular reference to Prussia and Russia,

a subject which so far has received practically no treatment at all (with the exception of the well-known work by Otto Krauske, *Die Entstehung der ständigen Diplomatie vom 15. Jahrh. bis zu den Beschlüssen von 1815 und 1818* (Leipzig, 1885). The peculiar spelling "Car", instead of the generally admitted "Zar" or "Czar" is rather surprising. If this study could be supplemented by information from the Russian archives it would present, undoubtedly, a valuable contribution to the history of diplomacy, but even in its present limited shape it should not be overlooked. L. I. S.

Die anglo-russische Entente, 1903–1907, by Ludwig Poltz (Hamburg, privately printed, 1932, pp. vii, 234) is an expanded doctor's thesis. The first half of the book is devoted to a survey of Anglo-Russian relations 1904–1906, in which the treatment of the Dogger Bank incident is noteworthy. After tracing the negotiations of 1906–1907 as a whole, special chapters deal separately with Tibet, Persia, and Afghanistan. It is only in the excellent conclusion that any attempt at synthesis is made. England is pictured as taking the initiative in bringing about the *entente,* which is to be considered as a European, rather than a mere colonial affair. E. C. H.

The well-known German historian, Professor Hermann Oncken, of the University of Berlin, has presented his conception of pre-war history in *Das deutsche Reich und die Vorgeschichte des Weltkrieges* (Leipzig, Barth, pp. 870, 33 M.). It appears at the same time as volumes VI. and VII. of *Der Grosse Krieg, 1914–1918,* edited by Lieutenant General Schwarte.

Giovanni Mira has given a good account of *Autunno 1918: Come finì la guerra mondiale* (Milan, Mondadori, 1932, pp. 502).

The Société de l'histoire de la guerre has added to its series of catalogues of the Bibliothèque et Musée de la guerre a *Catalogue méthodique du Fonds russe de la bibliothèque,* compiled by the librarian, Alexander Dumesnil, with the aid of Wilfrid Lerat, chief of the Oriental section. Camille Bloch, the director, has written an introduction. There are listed 6241 items. Three indexes are included, Russian authors, other authors, names cited and subject matter. The publisher is Alfred Costes (Paris, 1932, pp. xiv, 234, 200 fr.).

Articles: Romolo Quazza, *Il periodo italiano della guerra dei Trent' anni* (Riv. Stor. Ital., Jan.); Franco Borlandi, *Relazioni politico-economiche fra Inghilterra e Sardegna durante la Rivoluzione e l'Impero* [I., 1793–1802] (*ibid.*); Eberhard Kessel, *Die Wandlung der Kriegskunst im Zeitalter der französischen Revolution* (Hist. Zeitsch., June 30); Augustin Renaudet, *L'Europe aux XIX^e^ siècle: Une histoire des forces spirituelles* (Rev. Synthèse, June); Marie von Bunsen, *Die Briefe der Fürstin Radziwill an den General von Robilant* [Comments on a recent collection] (Berl. Monatsh., Aug.); Wilhelm Treue, *Presse und Politik in Deutschland und England während des*

Burenkrieges (*ibid.*); E. C. Helmreich, *Die serbisch-bulgarischen Verträge von 1904* (*ibid.*); Paul Herre, *Die kleinen Staaten und die Entstehung des Weltkrieges* [VI., *Die mitteleuropäischen Staaten*] (*ibid.*, July).

Documents: S. K. Padover, ed., *Prince Kaunitz' Résumé of his Eastern Policy, 1763–1771* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Aug.).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

The four hundredth anniversary of the birthday of Queen Elizabeth (Sept. 7, 1933) is to be marked by a biography of the queen by J. E. Neale of the University of London, one of the foremost living authorities on Tudor England. The book will be addressed to the general reader and will be published in this country by Harcourt, Brace and Company.

On June 26 the foundation stone of the new buildings in Bloomsbury for the University of London was laid amid impressive ceremonies. Their Majesties the King and the Queen honored the occasion by their presence. Upon the invitation of the University of London the American Historical Association named as its delegate Mr. Francis Russell Hart. Mr. Hart reports that the ceremonies proceeded with a warmth and enthusiasm enhanced by unusual dignity.

The Catalogue of Manuscripts and other Objects in the Museum of the Public Record Office, with Brief Descriptive and Historical Notes, compiled by Sir H. C. Maxwell Lyte, K.C.B. (H. M. Stationery Office, pp. x, 96, 1*s.*) has reached a fourteenth edition, which embodies numerous additions.

The Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions of Scotland: Fife, Kinross, and Clackmannan (Edinburgh, H. M. Stationery Office) deals with the east-central peninsula of Scotland, in point of time ending with the Union. The region was once very rich in ecclesiastical monuments, but only fragments remain, sad reminders of the savagery of the religious wars of the sixteenth century. In general, however, the historical monuments that still exist are very rich, and are illustrated in this report by five hundred plans and photographs.

A book of interest in the history of the troubled times of the Catholic Church in Ireland is *A Bishop of the Penal Times: Being Letters and Reports of John Brenan, Bishop of Waterford, 1671–1693, and Archbishop of Cashel, 1677–1693,* by Professor P. Canon Power [Irish Historical Documents, no. 3] (Cork, University Press).

The Wrenn Society has brought out through the Oxford University Press Part II. of *The Parochial Churches of Sir Christopher Wrenn, 1666–1718.*

The story of one of the most tragic events in the history of Scotland is told again in *The Massacre of Glencoe* (G. P. Putnam's Sons, pp. xii, 176, $1.50)

by John Buchan, and the tale loses nothing of its grim fascination at the hands of a writer whose power of narration is so well known. The scenes have long been familiar to Colonel Buchan and his account is based on the best sources.

Vol. II. of *The Private Papers of John, Earl of Sandwich, First Lord of the Admiralty, 1771–1782,* edited for the Navy Records Society by G. R. Barnes and J. H. Owen (London, William Clowes, pp. xiv, 400, 25*s.* 6*d.*) throws considerable light upon the unpreparedness of the British navy for the crisis precipitated by the entry of the French into the American Revolutionary War. The difficulties of the situation were enhanced by the distrust which, with good reason, Admiral Keppel felt in regard to Lord Sandwich. The volume covers the period from March, 1778, to May, 1779, and includes the battle off Ushant.

A history of *The British Anti-Slavery Movement,* by R. Coupland, has been added to the Home University Library.

Professor R. W. Rich's *Training Teachers in England and Wales during the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge University Press) brings the story down to 1903. His book throws light on an important phase of educational administration in a country noted for eccentricities in that field. W. T. L.

C. E. Whiting, professor of history in Durham, marks the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the oldest of the modern English universities of England in *The University of Durham, 1832–1932* (Sheldon Press). University College, London, was founded earlier, but the university dates from 1837. W. T. L.

Mr. E. F. Benson's *King Edward VII., an Appreciation* (Longmans) is what its title indicates. A more influential rôle than some will admit is attributed to the prince in the long period before he came to the throne, but the book presents a useful perspective of an influential life in a notable time.

Lord Riddell's War Diary, 1914–1918 (Nicholson and Watson) is an important addition to the list of published remains of men who were active in the war years. The diarist was a close personal friend of Mr. Lloyd George and served as intermediary between the government and the press. Thus his notes have a piquant interest even when they do not contain important information. W. T. L.

The Queen and Mr. Gladstone, vol. I. (Hodder and Stoughton), by Philip Guedalla, contains a first installment of 625 letters illustrating the relations of two great historic figures. Only ninety-one of these have previously been published. It is proposed to print 1500 out of a total of 6000 documents placed at the disposal of Mr. Guedalla by the Gladstone Trustees. The first volume closes on the eve of Gladstone's second ministry.

England in the Eighteenth Century (Robert M. McBride) by Professor R. B. Mowat, does not fill the need of a textbook on that subject. Instead of a synthesis leaving some impression of changes through time, there are twenty-one chapters, each, save the four allotted to the American Revolution, devoted to a separate topic with little regard for chronology. The author seems to be more interested in pointing morals than in narrating the course of events. A number of topics are mentioned, but a consecutive story through the century is told of none. Almost every chapter contains inaccurate statements of facts; for example, the assumption (p. 270) that the flying shuttle was used in spinning. W. T. L.

A History of England, by C. E. Carrington, formerly lecturer in history at Pembroke College, Oxford, and J. Hampden Jackson, assistant master at Haileybury College (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan, 1932, pp. xviii, 803, $2.00), is a textbook primarily intended for the middle and upper forms of the English schools. It is interesting to see that the authors have resisted the tendency, illustrated in American textbooks, to throw the emphasis on the recent period. The volume is provided with well-chosen pictures and maps.

Recent publications of H. M. Stationery Office are: *Acts of the Privy Council of England, 1623–1625,* issued under the direction of the Master of the Rolls; *Journal of the Commissioners for Trade and Plantations from January, 1754, to December, 1758,* preserved in the Public Record Office; *Calendar of Treasury Books, April, 1696, to March, 1696–1697,* vol. XI., preserved in the Public Record Office, prepared by William A. Shaw.

The Alexander Prize will be awarded by the Royal Historical Society for the best essay on any subject approved by the literary director. Essays must be sent in by March 31, 1934. For further particulars apply to the Honorary Secretary, Royal Historical Society, 22 Russell Square, London, W. C. 1.

Articles: A. Jean Thorogood, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in the Reign of Ecgberht* (Eng. Hist. Rev., July); Edith Clark Lowry, *Clerical Proctors in Parliament and Knights of the Shire, 1280–1374* (*ibid.*); N. B. Lewis, *Re-election to Parliament in the Reign of Richard II.* (*ibid.*); N. Denholm-Young, *Edward of Windsor and Bermondsey Priory* (*ibid.*); L. C. Latham, *Collection of the Wages of the Knights of the Shire in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (*ibid.*); Mary Elizabeth Bohannon, *The Essex Election of 1604* (*ibid.*); E. S. de Beer, *Members of the Court Party in the House of Commons, 1670–1678* (Bull. Inst. Hist. Research, June); Guy Parsloe and W. G. Bassett, *Bibliographical Aids to Research* [II.]*: British Parliamentary Papers, Catalogues and Indexes* (*ibid.*); Robert H. George, *Treasure Trove of William Phips* (New Eng. Quar., June); C. H. Karraker, *Spanish Treasure, Casual Revenue of the Crown* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Aug.); Robert M. Lees,

The Constitutional Importance of the Commissioners for Wool of 1689: an Administrative Experiment of the Reign of William III. (Economica, May); James H. Warner, *The Reaction in Eighteenth Century England to Rousseau's two "Discours"* (Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc. Am., June); Allen Walker Read, *British Recognition of American Speech in the Eighteenth Century* (Dialect Notes, VI., pt. VI.); Cuthbert Wright, *Second Spring: the Tractarian Movement, 1833–1933* (Sewanee Rev., July); O. E. H., *The Tractarian Movement in Oxford* (Bodleian Quar. Rec., 2nd Quarter); John W. Fortescue, The *Undergraduate through the Centuries* (Blackwoods, July); Bonamy Dobrée, *Macaulay* (Criterion, July); F. S. Rodkey, *The Attempts of Briggs and Company to guide British Policy in the Levant in the Interest of Mehemet Ali Pasha, 1821–1841* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Aug.); G. A. Ballard, *British Battleships of 1870, the Resistance and the Defence* (Mariner's Mirror, July).

Documents: H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles, eds., *The Provisions of Oxford: a Forgotten Document and some Comments* (Bull. John Rylands Library, July); *Documents relating to the Sheriff's Turn in North Wales* (Bull. Board of Celtic Studies, May); A. F. Pollard, ed., *A Lawsuit over Edward Hall's Will* (Bull. Inst. Hist. Research, June); *Some Letters of Admiral the Hon. Samuel Barrington* [1770–1778, chiefly to the Earl of Sandwich, originals in possession of Viscount Barrington] (Mariner's Mirror, July).

FRANCE

General review: Louis Halphen, *Histoire de France: Le Moyen Age jusqu'aux Valois* [concl'd] (Rev. Hist., May).

The new volume of the *Répertoire méthodique de l'histoire moderne et contemporaine de la France* covers the years 1912–1913 (Paris, Rieder, pp. 176, 50 fr.). The editors are Marcel Bouteron, Robert Burnand, and Pierre Caron.

The *Annales de l'Est,* sér. 4, fasc. 2, *Bibliographie Lorraine* (Nancy, Berger-Levrault, pp. xiv, 403), vol. X., covering the years 1928, 1929, 1930, appears in a new form, and after this number will be published annually. The titles are listed in the usual bibliographical form, brief analyses being given where the title does not sufficiently indicate the contents. The bibliography is divided into chapters by periods or by topics. Reviews of the more important works are appended to the chapters where they are listed. Several new contributors appear, MM. Marot, Duvernoy, Klipffel, and Linckenheld.

Portraits du XVIII^e siècle, with the subtitle of *La douceur de vivre,* by Pierre de Nolhac (Paris, Plon, pp. 228, 25 fr.) illustrates the present tendency in France to rehabilitate, if not to glorify, the Old Régime. The first essay deals with Le vrai caractère de Louis XV., presenting him as a constructive statesman. As to his private character, "Qu'importent quelques maîtresses

dans un règne où tels problèmes se posent". There is a long and interesting essay on Voltaire's share in forming the intelligence of the century's most "brillant nom féminin", Madame de Pompadour. The interest of the portraits centers, however, upon the artists of the period, Nattier, La Tour, Robert, and Mme. Vigée-Lebrun.

Jean Jacques Rousseau et le projet de constitution pour la Corse, by Ernestine Dedeck-Héry, is a thesis in the department of Romance Languages, in the University of Pennsylvania. In addition to the negotiations themselves, it deals with the echoes of the discussion in the world of letters.

Pierre Moreau's *La conversion de Chateaubriand* (Paris, Alcan)—a new volume in the Énigmes de l'histoire series—leaves the "enigma" largely unexplained. The *mal du siècle* that seized so many literary men of the turn of the century, among them Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey, Friedrich Schlegel, Novalis, and Manzour, and, in the end, drove them back into the Church, was an international phenomenon which followed the Revolutionary attack on Christianity. This study of Chateaubriand fails to place his conversion in its setting, and though carefully documented from the sources so far as Chateaubriand is concerned, the account seems to be written in a vacuum. F. B. A.

Articles: Louis Guichard, *La marine et la frontière* [sketch of French naval policy, 13th century to present] (Rev. Sci. Pol., Apr.); Roger Doucet, *Le grand Parti de Lyon au XVI^e siècle* [I.] (Rev. Hist., May); Fritz Kiener, *Quelques aperçus sur Strasbourg et Mulhouse* (*ibid.*); Pierre Perrenet, *Un jeune Dijonnais à Paris en 1673, Pierre Taisard* (Rev. Études Hist., Mar.); E. Lainé, *Une tentative de renversement des alliances sous Louis XIV.: Le baron de Mandat* (*ibid.*); E. Deborde de Montcorin, *Maisons-Lafitte et son chateau à travers l'histoire* (*ibid.*); Paul Jeulin, *Une page d'histoire du commerce nantais du XVI^e siècle au début du XVIII^e siècle: Aperçus sur la contractation de Nantes, 1530–c. 1733* (An. Bretagne, XL., no. 2); *Abbé* Raison, *Le mouvement janséniste au diocèse de Rennes* (*ibid.*); Colonel Herlaut, *Projet de création d'une banque royale en France à la fin du règne de Louis XIV., 1702–1712* (Rev. Hist. Mod., Mar.); Justus Hashagen, *Zur Deutung Rousseaus* (Hist. Zeitsch., June 30); David Williams, *The Influence of Rousseau on Political Opinion, 1760–95* (Eng. Hist. Rev., July); J. Loutchisky, *Régime agraire et populations agricoles dans les environs de Paris à la veille de la Révolution* [translated from the Russian by Mme. N. Stchoupak: the last essay of the lamented Russian historian] (Rev. Hist. Mod., Mar.); Jacques Collot, *La légion de Rosenthal* (Rev. Quest. Hist., June); Jacques Godechot, *Les insurrections militaires sous le Directoire* (An. Hist. Rév. Fr., May); Abel Mansuy, *Robespierre vu de Pologne* (*ibid.*); Étienne Pollio, *Le commerce maritime pendant la Révolution: Le commerce libéré* [II.] (Rév.

Fr., Apr.); Hermann Wendorf, *Die Ideewelt des Fürsten Talleyrand, ein Versuch* (Hist. Vierteljahr., July); Marcel Marion, *Le brigandage pendant le Consulat* (Rev. D. M., July 1); L. J. Adher, *Les électeurs à la Chambre des représentants, mai, 1815* [concl'd] (Rev. Fr., Apr.); Pierre de La Gorce, *Napoléon III. et sa Politique* [I., concl.] (Rev. D. M., May 15, June 1).

Documents: Geoffrey Bruun, ed., *Deux lettres de Chabot à Saint Just concernant la conspiration de l'étranger* (An. Hist. Rév. Fr., May); Jean Hanoteau, ed., *Lettres de la Reine Hortense au Prince Eugène* [I.] (Rev. D. M., July 15); Paul Duchon, ed., *Souvenirs de Jacques Laffitte sur Louis-Philippe et Benjamin Constant* (Rev. Paris, July 1).

THE NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

The government of Belgium is publishing, under the direction of Joseph Cuvelier, a series of *Inventaires des archives de Belgique*. Four volumes have already appeared. In the first volume are inventoried the documents of the Conseil royal de Philippe V., the Conseil d'État de Maximilien-Emmanuel à Namur, and of the Ambassade d'Espagne à La Haye. The second is interesting for the Napoleonic period, presenting the archives of the Arrondissement de la Flandre orientale et du département ou préfecture de l'Escaut.

An important contribution to the early history of medieval municipalities is made by Mr. Hans van Werveke, archivist of the city of Ghent, in *Kritische Studiën betreffende de oudste Geschiedenis van de Stad Ghent*, a publication of the University of Ghent (Antwerp, De Sikkel).

A volume by A. Van Hulzen, *Utrecht in 1566 en 1567* (Groningen, 1932) is of especial interest because it shows how the troubles in Flanders and Brabant had their repercussions farther north.

A Louvain doctoral thesis of interest is that of Gabryelle van den Haute on *Les relations anglo-hollandaises au début du XVIII^e siècle d'après la correspondance d'Alexandre Stanhope, 1700–1706* (Louvain, Uystpruyst, 1932, pp. xi, 379). Stanhope was the English minister at The Hague.

Articles: Jules Closon, *Un évêque de Liége peu connu de la fin du XIII^e siècle: Jean d'Enghien, 1274–1281* (Bull. Inst. Archéol. Liégeois, LVII. 41–82); F. Quicke, *Une enquête sur les droits et revenus du duc de Limbourg, seigneur de Dalhem et des pays d'Outremeuse, 1389–1393* (Bull. Com. Roy. Hist., Belgique, XCVI., no. 4); Sebastianus Tromp, *De manuscriptis praelectionum Lovaniensium S. Roberti Bellarmini, S. J.: Chronologia et problemata annexa* (Arch. Hist. Soc. Jesu, July).

Documents: Alfred de Ridder, ed., *Journal du siège d'Anvers, 1832, par lieutenant-colonel Vaillant* (Bull. Com. Roy. Hist., Belgique, XCVI., no 4).

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA

Die Urkunden des Rodenegg-Archives, 1288–1340, by Leo Santifaller (fasc. 21 of Schlern-Schriften, Veröffentlichungen zur Landeskunde von Südtirol, Innsbruck, Wagner, pp. xliii, 116) is a collection of fifty-three documents from the rich archives of this Austrian castle; most of them are in German and concern feudal relations.

A contribution of value to the polemic literature of the sixteenth century is the edition by H. Volz of the little known Catholic replies to Luther's confession of faith of 1536, now published under the title *Drei Schriften gegen Luthers schmalkaldische Artikel von Cochläus, Witzel und Hoffmeister, 1538, 1539* (Munster, Aschendorff, 1932, pp. lxix, 225; Corpus Catholicorum, vol. XVIII.).

The part played by the small Rhenish states as places of refuge for the French *émigrés* during the Revolution lends interest to the monograph by Bernhard Josef Kreuzberg on *Die politischen und wirtschaftlichen Beziehungen des Kurstaates Trier zu Frankreich in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts bis zum Ausbruch der französischen Revolution* (Bonn, Röhrscheid, 1932, pp. xvi, 203; Rheinisches Archiv, Bd. 21).

Professor Willy Andreas's *Rektoratsrede* at the University of Heidelberg, November 22, 1932, with the subject *Preussen und Reich in Carl Augusts Geschichte* has been added to the series of Heidelberger Universitätsreden (Heidelberg, Carl Winters, 1932, pp. 36, 1 M.). In the printed form there is a somewhat more detailed discussion of the attitude of Charles Augustus toward Prussia, with his criticism of the Prussian administration and military leadership before Jena.

A valuable study in economic history, which was the author's thesis for his *doctorat ès lettres,* has been written by Pierre Benaerts on *Les origines de la grande industrie allemande* (Paris, Turot, pp. 680).

Collecting his material from newspapers, pamphlets, diplomatic documents and memoirs, political verse, and other sources, Helmut Tiedemann has assembled systematically for the first time the evidences of the growth of *Der deutsche Kaisergedanke vor und nach dem Wiener Kongress* (Breslau, Marcus, 1932, pp. viii, 175; Untersuchungen, Dtsch. Staats-u. Rechtsgesch.).

In *Bismarcks Glaube im Spiegel der "Loosungen und Lehrtexte"* (C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Munich, pp. 54) Arnold Oskar Meyer has given newly found evidence that the fundamental elements of Bismarck's faith remained unshaken to the end. These small volumes of daily texts were each year presented to him by his friend Hans von Kleist-Retzow and are preserved by Bismarck's grandson.

The article on Hitler's Reich: the First Phase, which the editor of *Foreign*

Affairs, Hamilton Fish Armstrong, published in the July number of that journal has now been expanded into a small volume under the same title (Macmillan, pp. 73, $1.00). The statements are based upon observations made during a recent visit to Germany, and upon conversations with the new leaders. It is not a pleasant picture that Mr. Armstrong has drawn, but it reproduces the situation with clearness and brevity.

Dr. Nathaniel P. Clough in his dissertation entitled *Die deutsch-österreichische Anschlussfrage in der öffentlichen Meinung Amerikas,* which was undertaken at the suggestion of Professor Willy Andreas of Heidelberg, presents the tendencies of public opinion both before and after the proposals of 1931.

Articles: Hermann Aubin, *Die Ostgrenze des alten deutschen Reiches: Enstehung und staatsrechtlicher Charakter* (Hist. Vierteljahr., July); Erwin Hölzle, *Das Napoleonische Staatssystem in Deutschland* (Hist. Zeitsch., June 30).

E. N. C.

ITALY AND SPAIN

Two years ago Alessandro Luzio retired after thirty years of archival service at Mantua and Turin. His colleagues have prepared in his honor two formidable volumes of *Mélanges historiques* dealing especially with questions of the organization of archives; useful information is given on those of Zara, Trente, Trieste, and Bolzano as well as the better known collections of Naples, Florence, Venice, and Palermo. The work is entitled *Ad Alessandro Luzio, gli archivi di stato italiano: Miscellanea di studi storici* (Florence, Lemonnier, pp. 430, 442).

Vol. III. of Pietro Castagnoli's extensive work on *Il Cardinale Alberoni* deals with his career as papal legate at Ravenna, 1735–1739, and at Bologna, 1740–1743 (Monografie del Collegio Alberoni, fasc. 9; Rome, 1932, pp. 305).

The concordat between the Holy See and Italy lends interest to Maturi's recent volume on the Neapolitan concordat of 1818 and to *Il Concordato di Toscana, 25 Aprile 1851,* by A. M. Bettanini (Milan, Vita e Pensiero, pp. 200; Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del S. Cuore, serie IX., vol. IV.).

The inner history of the papacy, especially during the pontificate of Pius X., is illumined by the biography of *Cardinale Raffaele Merry del Val* (Rome, Berutti), of which the author is Monsignor Pio Cenci, Vatican archivist.

The new collection of Pistoian historical material [Rerum Pistoriensium Scriptores], published by the Società Pistoiese di Storia Patria, has for its first volume the *Cronaca della venuta dei Bianchi e della Moria, 1333–1400,* written in form of a diary by Ser Luca di Bartolomeo Dominici, an important contemporary official of that city. The chronicle, of importance linguistically

as well as for the history of Tuscany, is edited by G. C. Gigliotti (Pistoia, Pacinotti, pp. 294).

The municipal government of Naples during the first half of the nineteenth century furnishes the theme of *Il decurionato di Napoli, 1807–1861*, by A. Cutolo (Naples, a cura del Comune, 1932, pp. 197).

A useful work of reference, giving an alphabetic table of families belonging to the Sardinian nobility and an account of their juridical position in feudal and modern times is P. T. Vittorio's *I privilegi di stamento militare nelle famiglie sarde* (Turin, pp. 482).

Les quatre femmes de Philippe II. (Paris, Alcan, pp. xii, 249, 15 fr.), by Marcel Dhanys, with a preface by Louis Bertrand of the French Academy, belongs to the series, Les énigmes de l'histoire. It is a sympathetic interpretation of Philip's character, brought out in the story of his four marriages. Of the four women two figures are pathetic, although not in the same sense—Mary Tudor and Elizabeth of Valois. The author endeavors to emphasize Philip's more human characteristics by quoting the letters to his children, written while he was campaigning in Portugal.

Articles: Anna M. Enriques, *La vendetta nella vita e nella legislazione fiorentina* (Arch. Stor. Ital., XIX., no. 1); Antonio Casertano, *Cesare Borgia al sacco di Capua* (N. Antol., June 16); André E. Sayous, *Christophe Colomb, Génois* (Rev. Hist., May); Piero Pieri, *La scienza militare italiana del Rinascimento* [late 15th and early 16th centuries] (Riv. Stor. Ital., Apr.); Franco Borlandi, *Relazioni politico-economiche fra Inghilterra e Sardegna durante la Rivoluzione e l'Impero* [concl., 1802–1814] (*ibid.*); Arturo Aly-Belfadel, *Cronache di Vesimo durante il periodo napoleonico, 1790–1814* (Riv. Stor. Arte e Arch. per la Provincia di Alessandria, Jan.); Ulderico Barengo, *Il generale Galateri e le accuse di Giovanni Re* [alleged savage repression of Mazzinian rising of 1833] (*ibid.*); E. Bianchi, *La resistenza contro Napoleone e l'arciduca Francesco d'Austria d'Este, 1811–1813* (N. Riv. Stor., Jan.); G. F. Guerrazzi, ed., *Francesco Domenico Guerrazzi nel 1859, da un diario inedito* [I., concl'd] (N. Antol., June 1, 16); Mario Caracciolo, *Il comando unico e l'esercito italiano* [1917–1918] (*ibid.*, July 1); Luigi Aldrovandi, *La settimana di passione adriatica: Parigi, 17–27 Aprile, 1919* [I., concl.; verbatim reports of conversations between Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau, Orlando, Sonnino] (*ibid.*, May 16, June 1); Eduardo Aunos, *Vers une constitution républicaine en Espagne* (Rev. Quest. Hist., June).

E. N. C.

NORTHERN EUROPE

A volume of *Briefe von Johannes und Olaus Magnus, den letzten katholischen Erzbischöfen von Upsala*, edited by Gottfried Buschbell (Stock-

holm, 1932) forms an important addition to the body of printed materials for the history of the North in the sixteenth century.

Students of municipal history will be interested in the publication of a series of charters and ordinances for the government of Swedish cities (*Privilegier, resolutioner, och förordningar för Sveriges städer*) of which Part II., 1523–1560, was published in 1932 (Stockholm, P. A. Norstedt and Sons). The work is under the editorial direction of Ernst Nygren.

The annual volume (*Årsskrift*) of the University of Upsala for 1933 is concerned with the plans and studies preliminary to the promulgation of the Swedish common law in the reign of Charles XI. (*Förarbetena till Sveriges rikes lag, 1666–1686,* Upsala). The volume is edited by J. E. Almquist.

The Danish society for language and literature (Dansk Sprog- og Litteraturselskab) has in preparation a new edition of the old provincial laws of Denmark (*Danmarks Gamle Landskabslove med Kirkelovene*). The publication is directed by Johannes Brönder-Nielsen and Paul Johannes Jörgensen.

F. Wedel Jarlsberg who retired recently from the Norwegian diplomatic service after an official tenure of fifty years has written an interesting account of his experiences in that service under the title, *Reisen gennem livet* [the journey through life] (Oslo, Gyldendal, 1932). Of particular importance is the section that deals with life and events in Paris in the years before and during the Great War.

Gustav III. von Schweden und die preussische Politik nach dem Tode Friedrichs des Grossen is the title of a significant study by Alfons Siegel and published as a volume of the *Erlanger Abhandlungen* (Erlangen, Palm and Enke, pp. 193, 8.50 M.).

An academic dissertation of unusual merit is Birger Fahlborg's study of Swedish foreign policy in the years following the return to peace in 1660. It makes a volume of about six hundred pages and examines the problem on all its important sides, political, geographic, and economic. (*Sveriges yttre politik, 1660–1664.* Stockholm, P. A. Norstedt and Sons, 1932.)

Nederland og Norge, 1625–1650, by Johan Schreiner is a monograph dealing with the Dutch trade in Norway, particularly with the lumber trade. (Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, Historisk-Filosoisk Klasse, no. 3, pp. 183.)

The history of the Estonian people is told in a brief but fairly satisfactory account by Hans Krus in his *Grundriss der Geschichte des estnischen Volkes* (Tartu, 1932, pp. 247, 4 Kr.). The author is concerned chiefly with the events of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The University of Dorpat (the founding of which was one of the last acts of Gustavus Adolphus) has just celebrated its three hundredth anniversary.

As a part of this celebration J. Bergman has published a small volume dealing with its fortunes during its Swedish period, *Universitetet i Dorpat under svenska tiden.* (Upsala, 1932, pp. 200.)

Hans von Eckhardt's *Russia* in its somewhat expanded English form is concerned almost entirely with Russian affairs in the last two decades. The translator is Catherine Alison Phillips. (London, Cape, 1932, pp. 711, 36*s*.)

Mr. George Vernadsky's paper on The Expansion of Russia, presented before the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences on February 16, has been published in vol. XXXI. of the *Transactions* of the Academy.

Articles: V. A. Milutin, *Die Vereinigung der Ukraine mit dem Moskauer Staat* (Zeitsch. Osteur. Gesch., III., no. 3); Karl Stählin, *Aus den Berichten der III. Abteilung S. M. höchsteigener Kanzlei an Kaiser Nikolaus I.* [concl'd] (*ibid.*).

Documents: A. Stratonov, ed., *Ein Projekt entworfen von der Kaiserin Katharina II.* [touching economic conditions of the imperial domain] (Zeitsch. Osteur. Gesch., III., no. 3).

L. M. L.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

As a short compact history of Czechoslovakia, *Malé Dějiny Československé* (Small Czechoslovak History), by Kamil Krofta (Prague, "Matice Česká", 1931, pp. 121), has no peer. Most of the Czechoslovak historical works usually fail to treat the history of the Kingdom of Bohemia and that of Slovakia as a unit. Krofta has synthesized it very successfully and his work is up to the usual high standard of his numerous other publications in the field of history. There are fourteen excellent historical photographs scattered throughout the volume, in addition to two maps showing the historical development of the Kingdom of Bohemia and Slovakia, and Carpathian Russia. A short selected bibliography concludes the work. J. S. R.

In Robert Fitzgibbon Young's *Comenius in England* (Oxford University Press, 1932, pp. 99) the documentary material is not only interesting but valuable to all those students of Komensky and of Komensky's times. Strictly speaking, little, if any, of it can be considered as "previously unpublished", but the debt owed Mr. Young is hardly less great. Extracted from ponderous and little known tomes, translated and put into true relation to each other, these "descriptions", letters, and fragments enable us to understand the reason for Komensky's visit to England, the events and the results of that visit, its effect on education and upon scientific knowledge, as well as upon the career of Komensky himself. Not the least important or interesting is the excursus on New England affairs in the course of which the exact measure of Komensky's connection with Harvard University and with the education of the Indians is made clear. A. I. A.

FAR EAST

General review: Harold M. Vinacke, *Japanese Imperialism* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Aug.).

Professor Harold Quigley's latest book, *Japanese Government and Politics* (Century Company, 1932, pp. xii, 442, $3.75) will not disappoint those who have learned to look to him for careful scholarly work in the field of Far Eastern political systems. After a brief introductory treatment of pre-Meiji institutions and of the events leading up to the Meiji Restoration, the author proceeds to a topical analysis of present constitutional theory and practice. This analysis leads to the conclusion that "Japan's government cannot be called 'constitutional' in the democratic sense of the word". The executive procedure is shown to be especially clumsy: "It is painfully slow; it conceals responsibility in a maze of interchanges; it does not ensure against deadlocks; and it places the cabinet at the bottom of a hierarchy of oligarchical agencies of control." Yet Dr. Quigley believes that "the situation can be metamorphosed without amending the constitution; so that, as popular influence and knowledge of affairs increase, the cabinet may assume its true rôle as the working executive, the Privy Council and the supreme command acting as advisers to it, while the responsibility of the executive to the Emperor and to the people is guaranteed by the Diet." An appendix of ninety-three pages contains, in addition to more readily available documents, eight party platforms dating between 1910 and 1931. G. N. S.

Articles: Marquess of Reading, *The Progress of Constitutional Reform in India* (Foreign Affairs, July); George H. Blakeslee, *The Japanese Monroe Doctrine* (*ibid.*).

UNITED STATES

GENERAL

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: forty papers of Mrs. Benjamin Stoddert, dated 1766–1800; thirteen of General Richard S. Ewell and nine of General David M. Gregg, Civil War generals; military papers of Captain Benjamin F. Weeks, Ninth Army Corps, U. S. A., 1861–1871, about 450 pieces; three boxes of additional papers of Charles F. McKim, 1887–1925; and seven volumes and fifty-eight packages of papers of the National League of Women Voters, dated mainly from 1920 to 1930.

The United States George Washington Bicentennial Commission, of which Representative Sol Bloom is the director, is bringing its work to an appropriate conclusion, by the publication of three quarto volumes, sumptuously printed and illustrated, embodying not only what has been written under the direct inspiration of the commission, but also addresses, orations,

sermons, and essays called forth by the many celebrations of the great occasion. Volume I. opens with the fifteen pamphlets prepared for the commission chiefly by its historian, Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, and by Mr. David M. Matteson. These deal with many phases of Washington's career. Pamphlet 15 is a Classified Washington Bibliography, compiled by a committee of the American Library Association. This volume also includes *The George Washington Atlas,* by Lawrence Martin, of the Library of Congress. Volume II. is made up for the most part of studies of features of the period in which Washington lived, Colonial Gardens, the Music of George Washington's Time, and a collection of patriotic tunes entitled Music from the Days of George Washington. This volume contains also the addresses of the director, Representative Bloom, many of which were broadcast, and the text of Wakefield, a Folk-Masque of America, by Percy MacKaye.

A National Plan for American Forestry (73 Cong., 1 sess., Senate Doc. 12), a report in two volumes, of nearly 1500 pages, is chiefly as its title indicates, an exposition of future needs and of methods of meeting them—and a very impressive one—but a great deal of valuable historical material is to be found in its pages, especially in the survey (pp. 733–842) of state accomplishments and plans by Mr. Herbert A. Smith, assistant forester.

Last year, in commemoration of the Washington Bicentennial, the Deutsche Akademie invited Professor Carl Wittke, of the Ohio State University, to deliver in Germany a course of lectures entitled "George Washington und seine Zeit". These lectures have now been published by the Academy as vol. I. of *Schriften der Länderausschüsse.* They are eight in number, each on a distinct theme, but all possessing unity of aim, to give to a German audience an introduction to important phases of American history.

Dr. Frank Monaghan's *French Travellers in the United States, 1765–1932* (New York Public Library, pp. xxii, 114) was first published in successive numbers of the *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library. In its present form it includes items discovered after the original publication began. It now contains more than 1800 entries, incidentally showing, as the author remarks, that the "old generalization about the French being infrequent travellers no longer has any great degree of truth". This bibliography has opened to the student of American social history a rich mine of material hitherto unknown or neglected. "It is not confined to the reports of the mere travels themselves, but is meant to include all writings in which the influence of their travels and observations is expressly stated or in which that influence can be definitely traced."

The *Agriculture of the American Indians,* a bibliography by Everett E. Edwards, of the Department of Agriculture, has been issued in a second edition with addenda.

Two dissertations of much practical value in the study of American Catholicism have been published by the Catholic University of America: *Pontificia Americana: a Documentary History of the Catholic Church in the United States, 1784–1864,* by Rev. Donald C. Shearer, and *A History of the Legal Incorporation of Catholic Church Property in the United States, 1784–1932,* by Rev. Patrick J. Dignan. Another recent dissertation in the same university is entitled *Recent Changes in the Recognition Policy of the United States,* by John L. McMahon.

Articles: N. H. Dawes and F. T. Nichols, *George Bancroft* (New Eng. Quar., June); V. G. Setser, *Did Americans originate the Conditional Most-Favored-Nation Clause?* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Aug.); George C. Keidel, compiler, *Early American Newspapers* (Maryland Hist. Mag., June); Joseph Schafer, *Turner's Frontier Philosophy* (Wisconsin Mag. Hist., June); Samuel Knox Wilson, *Bishop Briand and the American Revolution* (Cath. Hist. Rev., July); Clyde Potts, *The Morristown National Historical Park* (Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc., July); George Verne Blue, *France and the Oregon Question* [II.] (Oregon Hist. Quar., June); Fritiof Ander, *Some Factors in the Americanization of the Swedish Immigrant, 1850–1890* (Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc., Apr.); *id., Swedish-American Newspapers and the Republican Party, 1855–1875* (Augustana Hist. Soc. Pub., no. 2); Richard H. Shryock, *The Nationalistic Tradition of the Civil War* (South Atlantic Quar., July).

Documents: Harry Miller Lydenberg, *Archibald Robertson: his Diaries and Sketches in America, 1762–1780* [V., VI., VII.] (Bull. N. Y. Public Library, June, July, Aug.); *Letters of Fr. John Rosseter to Bishop Carroll* [cont'd] (Records Am. Cath. Hist. Soc., June); *The Deputy Adjutant General's Orderly Book, Ticonderoga, September and October, 1776* (Bull. Fort Ticonderoga Museum, July).

NEW ENGLAND

The Massachusetts Historical Society has published the fourth volume in continuation of John Langdon Sibley's *Biographical Sketches of Graduates of Harvard University* in September ($7.50). This volume, prepared by Dr. Clifford K. Shipton (A.B., Harvard, 1926), is the first of a series with which the society proposes to carry Mr. Sibley's work up through 1825, at least. This fourth volume contains the lives of graduates of the classes of 1690 to 1700, inclusive. The fifth volume of this work is now in preparation.

Volume XIV. of the *Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts* will be issued late this autumn. The third volume of *Winthrop Papers,* covering the years 1631–1634, inclusive, will not be published until late in 1934. In October, 1934, the society plans to issue *Proceedings* (vol.

LXV.) covering two years, 1932–1933 and 1933–1934. Volume LXIV. (1930–1931 and 1931–1932) was distributed in October, 1932.

A *Handbook of the Publications of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 1790–1933,* is now ready. This, it is hoped, fulfills the wish which the late Professor Edward Channing expressed as long ago as 1900. The first of the three sections of the *Handbook* consists of synopses of the contents of all the *Collections, Proceedings,* and special volumes published by the society. A second section comprises a series of indexes to these synopses and to all the various papers, memoirs, and illustrations. The third section lists all the photostat series regularly issued by the society: the Americana series, edited by Dr. Worthington C. Ford, editor emeritus; the colonial newspapers; and miscellaneous volumes. This *Handbook* was planned only to supplement, not supplant, the many indexes which must be consulted by those desirous of knowing the contents of the publications of the society. Index references in this *Handbook* are to volumes, not pages. The cost is $1.00.

The *Proceedings* of the Vermont Historical Society has been changed from a quarterly to an annual publication. The issue for 1932 is a monograph on the Unicameral Legislature of Vermont, by Daniel B. Carroll.

Articles: Henry S. Commager, *The Dilemma of Theodore Parker* (New Eng. Quar., June); Theodore Sizer, *James Jackson Jarves* (*ibid.*).

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

A detachment of about 300 men from the Civilian Conservation Corps has been at work during the past summer clearing the site of the Jockey Hollow encampment of the Continental Army, as a part of the new national park at Morristown, N. J. A similar principle of relief for the unemployed is illustrated at Newark, Ohio, where men out of work are given the task of restoration of the ancient mounds known as the Fairground Circle and the Eagle Mound.

The Wyoming Historical and Geological Society conducted an historical pilgrimage on June 6 and 7, visiting historic sites in the Wyoming Valley, the route of the Sullivan Expedition, and the Indian excavations at Athens. At the home of Colonel John Franklin, one of the bitterest contestants in the "Yankee-Pennamite" controversy over land titles, were inspected his papers still in the possession of his great-great-great grandson. At Montrose is the second largest collection of material on the Susquehannah Land Company. The most extensive collection is in the possession of the Wyoming Historical Society, an edition of which, edited by Julian P. Boyd, is now being published by that society.

The Western Pennsylvania Historical Survey has published as number 2

of its Bibliographical Contributions an *Inventory of Files of American Newspapers in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, Pennsylvania,* compiled by Franklin F. Holbrook. The Survey is also collecting by means of questionnaires information concerning files of western Pennsylvania newspapers to be found in newspaper offices and libraries of the section and in some of the larger libraries outside the section. Among recent additions to the collections of the Survey and the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania are miniature film reproductions of material of western Pennsylvania interest, the Gallatin Papers in the custody of the New York Historical Society and the Chalmers Collection of the New York Public Library; similar reproductions of a collection of correspondence of Henry Marie Brackenridge in private hands; papers of John Harper of Pittsburgh and members of his family ranging from 1833 to 1887 and including material on real estate holdings in Chicago, 1855–1872, correspondence with Dorothea L. Dix, 1858–1872, and a large group of letters, 1862–1865, of Albert M. Harper, an officer in the Civil War; a collection of bills of lading covering transportation by keel boat on the Allegheny River, 1839–1866; several thousand pages of transcripts of original records of twenty-three Lutheran, Reformed Brethren, and Baptist churches of Somerset County, Pennsylvania, 1774–1904; transcripts of Bridgeport (now South Brownsville), Pennsylvania, council records, 1814–1930; and a collection of Waynesburg, Pennsylvania, newspapers, 1866–1880. Dr. Leland D. Baldwin of the staff of the Survey is making an extended study of the Whiskey Insurrection.

Articles: Frank Monaghan, *An Examination of the Reputation of Captain Kidd* (New York History, July); T. Raymond Naughton, *Criminal Law in Colonial New York* (*ibid.*); Julius W. Pratt, *John O'Sullivan and Manifest Destiny* (*ibid.*); Harry J. Carman, *Jesse Buel, Albany County Agriculturalist* (*ibid.*); E. Clowes Chorley, *Samuel Provoost, First Bishop of New York* (Hist. Mag. Protestant Episcopal Church, June); Nelson R. Burr, *The Development of Education in New Jersey to 1781* (Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc., July); Harrold E. Gillingham, *Caesar Ghiselin, Philadelphia's First Gold and Silversmith, 1693–1733* (Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog., July); Ray H. Abrams, *The Jeffersonian, Copperhead Newspaper* (*ibid.*, July); Alfred P. James, *Opportunities for Research in the Early History of Western Pennsylvania* (Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag., May); Leland D. Baldwin, *The Rivers in the Early Development of Pennsylvania* (*ibid.*); William J. Martin, *The Old Log School, a Chronicle of Rural Education* (*ibid.*, Aug.); A. John Dodds, *Honest John Covode* (*ibid.*); Russell J. Ferguson, *Albert Gallatin* (*ibid.*); H. M. Smith, jr., *Fort Necessity* (Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog., July); Alfred Thurston Child, jr., *Prudence Crandall and the Canterbury Experiment* (Bull. Friends' Hist. Assoc., Spring); John

Umble, *The Amish Mennonites of Union County, Pennsylvania* [I.] (Mennonite Quar. Rev., Apr.).

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The *Third Annual Report* of the archivist, Dr. Lester J. Cappon, of the University of Virginia Library, for the year 1932–1933, is a report of progress in the survey and collection of manuscripts and other source materials on Virginia. The inventory of official and unofficial records of all kinds was extended the past year into Amherst, Charlotte, Cumberland, Fauquier, Lancaster, Montgomery, Surry, and Westmoreland counties. A number of valuable collections of manuscripts and account books were obtained for the University Library. A check-list of Virginia newspapers in the state and in leading repositories outside Virginia is in preparation for publication next year as Part I. of the projected *Guide* to Virginia historical sources.

The William and Mary College Library has received, as a gift from David Rankin Barbee, the diary of Robert Greenhow which he kept while on a secret mission in Mexico in 1829 for the Department of State.

An important accession to the papers of the North Carolina Historical Commission is the John Gray Blount Collection. It consists of more than 6000 letters and papers, dating for the most part before 1800. They relate to Blount's landed and mercantile interests, and to state and national politics. At the same time the commission received many Blount family relics illustrating the domestic life of the period. Among other recent acquisitions of the commission are: Medical daybook of Dr. S. J. Wheeler, of Bertie County, covering the years 1834–1872; war diary of William Edward Bradley, 1865; ordnance book, Company E, 50th North Carolina Regiment, C. S. A.; and 1000 issues of thirty-nine North Carolina newspapers prior to 1876.

The Southwest Virginia Historical Society is sponsoring the publication of a volume entitled *The Roanoke of Colonial Days, 1740–1776,* by F. B. Kegley. Information about the work may be obtained from the president of the society, J. A. Turner, Hollins, Va.

Articles: Paul H. Giddens, *Land Policies and Administration in Colonial Maryland, 1753–1769* (Maryland Hist. Mag., June); B. Howell Griswold, jr., *A Maryland Governor who never governed* (*ibid.*); G. MacLaren Brydon, *The Clergy of the Established Church in Virginia and the Revolution* [cont'd] (Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog., July); S. A. Ashe and Lyon G. Tyler, *Secession, Insurrection of the Negroes, and Northern Incendiarism* (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., July); William Cabell Moore, *General John Hartwell Cocke of Bremo, 1780–1866* (William and Mary College Quar. Hist. Mag., July); J. T. Lanning, *Don Miguel Wall and the Spanish Attempt against the Existence of Carolina and Georgia* (North Carolina

Hist. Rev., July); A. Wood Renton, *Comment la veille Espagne survit dans une colonie anglaise* (Rev. Hist. Diplomatique, Apr.); D. H. Gilpatrick, *North Carolina Congressional Elections, 1803–1810* (North Carolina Hist. Rev., July); Douglas C. McMurtrie, *The First Twelve Years of Printing in North Carolina, 1749–1760* (*ibid.*); *id., A Bibliography of South Carolina Imprints, 1731–1740* (South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag., July); J. Randolph Anderson, *The Spanish Era in Georgia and the English Settlement in 1733* (Georgia Hist. Quar., June); R. McC. B. Adams, *New Orleans and the War of 1812* [II.] (Louisiana Hist. Quar., July); Kathryn T. Abbey, *The Land Ventures of General Lafayette in the Territory of Orleans and State of Louisiana* (*ibid.*); *The Church in the Republic of Texas* (Hist. Mag. Protestant Episcopal Church, June); Amelia Williams, *A Critical Study of the Siege of the Alamo and of the Personnel of its Defenders* [II.] (Southwestern Hist. Quar., July).

Documents: M. H. Harris, ed., *Diary of Travels from Virginia to Tennessee in 1832,* by Thomas W. Claybrooke (William and Mary College Quar. Hist. Mag., July); Mabel L. Webber, ed., *Josiah Smith's Diary* [cont'd] (South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag., July); *Avondale and Deerbrook Plantation Documents* [I., Early County, Georgia, mid-nineteenth century] (Georgia Hist. Quar., June).

WESTERN STATES

The Mississippi Valley Historical Review for September contains an account of the last Annual Meeting (Apr. 13–16) of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, by Professor Avery O. Craven. The other articles are: The Government of the Oberlin Colony, by Robert S. Fletcher; The Religious Opinions of Thomas Jefferson, by William D. Gould; and Asa Whitney and his Pacific Railroad Publicity Campaign, by Margaret L. Brown. The document is Sergeant John Smith's Diary of 1776, edited by Louise Rau.

On September 3 at Vincennes, in connection with the George Rogers Clark Memorial, the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Peace of Paris was celebrated. The new interstate bridge over the Wabash, an integral part of the memorial, was dedicated. Senator Fess spoke at the laying of the cornerstone.

The Indiana Historical Society has acquired for its William Henry Smith Memorial Library a copy of the first English edition of James J. Audubon's *Birds of America.* The society expects to open its library in the new State Library and Historical Building before the end of the year.

The *Transactions* of the Illinois State Historical Society for the year 1932 contain the papers presented at the annual meeting in May. Among

the addresses was one entitled *George Washington, the Man,* by the late Carl Russell Fish.

Among recent accessions to the University of Illinois Library is a book of accounts and two books of letters and invoices of Frank R. Noble, a business man of Rockford, Illinois. The earliest volume is a manuscript book (ledger) of 556 pages, listing his accounts from October 18, 1872, to January 31, 1876. The two volumes of manuscript letters and invoices are dated 1876–1878.

The Augustana Historical Society has published a volume on *T. N. Hasselquist, the Career and Influence of a Swedish-American Clergyman, Journalist, and Educator,* by Fritiof Ander, associate professor of history, Augustana College.

Campaign Technique in Illinois—1860, by William Eldon Baringer, has been reprinted, as Publication no. 39, from the *Transactions* of the Illinois State Historical Society.

The State Historical Society of Iowa has added to its monograph series, as no. 5, *The Legislation of the Forty-Fifth General Assembly of Iowa* [1933], by Jacob A. Swisher and Ruth A. Gallaher.

The records of the Michigan Territorial Supreme Court and those of the State Supreme Court to 1858 have been deposited with the Michigan Historical Commission and are being arranged with a view to publication.

The William F. Vilas Papers are now open to the use of students in the manuscript division of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Upon their arrangement Miss Annie A. Nunns, the assistant superintendent, has been engaged for some time.

The Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee has published three bulletins of importance to students of American archæology: *Ethnobotany of the Forest Potawatomi Indians,* by Huron H. Smith, *Miwok Material Culture,* by S. A. Barrett and E. W. Gifford, and *Ancient Azatlan,* by S. A. Barrett. The Miwok lived in the Sierra Nevada mountains and a section of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley. Azatlan is in Wisconsin, and is an Indian site of the first rank, and Mr. Barrett's account of the excavations is detailed and comprehensive. The volume is illustrated with two maps, 161 figures, and 100 plates.

Vol. VII. of *Norwegian-American Studies and Records,* edited by T. C. Blegen, and published by the Norwegian-American Historical Association includes the following essays: Social Aspects of Prairie Pioneering: the Reminiscences of a Pioneer Pastor's Wife, by Mrs. R. O. Brandt; The Fraser River Gold Rush: an Immigrant Letter of 1858, translated and edited by C. A. Clausen; Some Recent Publications relating to Norwegian-American

History, III., compiled by Jacob Hodnefield; and A Hunt for Norwegian-American Records, by Carlton C. Qualey.

Additions to the Knute Nelson Papers in the possession of the Minnesota Historical Society have been received from former Governor J. A. O. Preus of Minneapolis. The Nelson Papers form the most extensive personal collection in the society's manuscript sources. Other acquisitions by the society include a German translation of Carver's *Travels,* published at Hamburg in 1780, a copy of a rare pamphlet—*An Account of a Voyage up the Mississippi River, from St. Louis to its Source*—in which is presented the earliest printed account of Zebulon M. Pike's expedition into the Minnesota country in 1805 and 1806; photostatic copies of the last census for Minnesota Territory, that for 1857, which round out the society's file of census records for the territorial period.

In connection with the celebration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of Minnesota's admission to the Union, the Minnesota Historical Society sponsored a series of anniversary radio programs over Minnesota broadcasting stations and arranged for a special program at the Historical Building in St. Paul on Statehood Day, May 11, the speakers including Frank B. Kellogg, Dean Guy Stanton Ford, and Dr. Theodore C. Blegen.

The June issue of *Minnesota History* is a "Diamond Jubilee Number", its pages chiefly devoted to a series of articles bearing the general title, The Emergence of the North Star State. These are: The Creation of the Territory, by Donald E. Van Koughnet; The Day of the Pioneer, by Theodore C. Blegen; Frontier Education, by Lois M. Fawcett; Early Transportation, and Admission to the Union, by Arthur J. Larsen; and The Heritage of Minnesota, by Governor Floyd B. Olson. In addition there is a collection of Statehood Editorials, edited by Bertha L. Heilbron.

Vol. XXI. of the University of California Publications in History consists of a historical monograph, *The French in Sonora, 1850–1854* (Berkeley, 1932), by Dr. Rufus K. Wyllys. The work deals with a series of expeditions by California Frenchmen into northwestern Mexico, for the purpose of detaching the Mexican State of Sonora or for seizing lands and mines therein. In particular the work covers the picturesque career of Count Gaston de Raousset-Boulbon, chief of these adventurers, and the effects of his exploits upon the international relations of the United States and Mexico.

The Forty-First Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society, for the year 1932, includes, besides the proceedings and reports, several essays, the following among others: New Bases for Hawaiian Chronology, by J. F. G. Stokes; Naturalization of Orientals in Hawaii prior to 1900, by Maude Jones; The Last Days of the *Atahualpa, alias Behring,* by F. W. Howay; and The Schooner *Missionary Packet,* by R. S. Kuykendall.

Articles: Benjamin P. Thomas, *Lincoln the Postmaster* (Bull. Abraham Lincoln Association, June); Mary Borgias Palm, *Kaskaskia, Indian Mission Village* (Mid-America, July); Gilbert J. Garraghan, *Catholic Beginnings in Chicago* (*ibid.*); Josephine Boylan, *Illinois Highways, 1700–1848: Roads, Rivers, Ferries, Canals* (Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc., Apr.); Hugo Erichsen, *My Memories of Old Detroit* (Michigan Hist. Mag., Spring); Kate E. Levi, *The Press and the* [*Wisconsin*] *Constitution* (Wisconsin Mag. Hist., June); Cora Dolbee, *The First Book on Kansas: the Story of Edward Everett Hale's Kansas and Nebraska* (Kansas Hist. Quar., May); George A. Root, *Ferries in Kansas* [I.]: *Missouri River* [cont'd] (*ibid.*); Lansing B. Bloom, *Fray Estévan de Perea's Relación* (New Mexico Hist. Rev., July); Muriel H. Wright, *Historic Places on the Old Stage Line from Fort Smith to Red River* (Chron. Oklahoma, June); F. Harold Young, ed., *William Hobson, Quaker Missionary* (Oregon Hist. Quar., June); Frederick E. Bolton, *High Schools in Territorial Washington* (Washington Hist. Quar., July).

Documents: *An Illinois Farmer during the Civil War: Extracts from the Journal of John Edward Young, 1859–1866* (Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc., Apr.); *Letters written by John P. Irish to George F. Parker* (Iowa Jour. Hist. and Pol., July); *German Pioneer Letters* [principally letters of Friederich Hilgen and William Schröder to Friederich Börner, 1846–1849] (Wisconsin Mag. Hist., June); Fritiof Fryxell, *Thomas Moran's Journey to the Tetons in 1879* (Augustana Hist. Soc. Pub., no. 2).

CANADA

The *Twenty-First Report* of the Department of Public Records of Ontario, by Dr. Alexander Fraser, deputy minister, embodies the Minutes of General Quarter Sessions of Peace for the Home District, March 13, 1800–December 28, 1811. This court, Dr. Fraser explains in his preface, was practically the local government of Upper Canada until the Act of Union.

At a well attended meeting held at Toronto on June 3 the Canadian Catholic Historical Association was founded. The following officers were elected: President, the Hon. F. R. Latchford, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Ontario; first vice president, the Rev. Edward Kelly, Toronto; second vice president, the Rev. J. B. O'Reilly, Toronto; secretary, Dr. J. F. Kenney, Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa; treasurer, Miss F. Boland, Toronto.

The papers of Edward Winslow, Loyalist, of Plymouth, Massachusetts, who migrated at the time of the Revolution to the Maritime Provinces and became a judge of the provincial court of New Brunswick—a large and important collection—have been deposited in the New Brunswick Museum at St. John by their owner, Mr. Edward P. Winslow, and somewhat later will be made available for examination by scholars.

The Société des Antiquaires of Picardy has published in its Collection des Mémoires a volume by A. Huguet on *Jean de Pontrincourt, fondateur de Port Royal en Acadie, vice-roi du Canada, 1577–1615: Campagnes, voyages, et aventures d'un colonisateur sous Henri IV.*

Articles: Dorothy E. Long, *English Interest in the Fur-Trade of Hudson Bay before 1670* (Canadian Hist. Rev., June); C. P. Stacey, *The Garrison of Fort Wellington: a Military Dispute during the Fenian Troubles* (*ibid.*); D. C. Harvey, *Confederation in Prince Edward Island* (*ibid.*); Arthur G. Doughty, *Sources for the History of the Catholic Church in the Public Archives of Canada* (Cath. Hist. Rev., July).

Documents: G. de T. Glazebrook, ed., *A Document concerning the Union of Hudson's Bay Company and the North West Company* (Canadian Hist. Rev., June).

CUBA, MEXICO, AND SOUTH AMERICA

A useful *Bibliography of the Liberator Simón Bolívar, compiled in the Columbus Memorial Library of the Pan American Union,* has been published to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of his birth (Washington, Pan American Union).

Dr. Vicente Davila has just published a brief *Biografía de Miranda* (Tipografia Americana, Caracas).

Plutarco E. Calles is the author of a brochure entitled *La rehabilitación de la Plata como moneda* (Secretaría de relaciones exteriores, Mexico).

Fernando de la Fuente has published a treatise on *El comunismo: Defensa mínima del ideal revolucionario mexicana* (Editorial Cultura, Mexico).

The results of personal visits to South American countries are presented in two studies of the aborigines by Moisés Sáenz: *Sobre el Indio Peruano y su incorporación al medio nacional,* and *Sobre el indio ecuatoriano y su incorporación al medio nacional* (Secretaría de educación pública, Mexico, 1933).

Orestes Ferrera has utilized inedited documents from European archives to prepare the treatise entitled *Tentativas de intervención europea en América* (Editorial Hermes, Havana), which deals with the war between the United States and Spain.

A dissertation entitled *Fiscal Intervention in Nicaragua,* presented to the Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University, by Roscoe R. Hill, formerly member of the Nicaragua High Commission, deals with the desperate financial situation which the Department of State in 1911 endeavored to correct through the provisions of the Knox-Castrillo Treaty. This the Senate did not

ratify. The crisis was met through a less direct intervention of American agencies, the action of which Mr. Hill regards as highly successful.

Articles: Luis Bossano, *Notas sobre el campesino ecuatoriano* (Anales de la Universidad Central, vol. L., no. 283); Nicolás García Samudio, *La división departmental y los orígenes del municipio en Colombia* (Boletín de Historia y Antigüedades, no. 226); *Compañía guipuzcoana, indice cronológico* (Boletín del Archivo Nacional, nos. 55 and 56); *Reales ordenes, indice cronológico* (*ibid.*); *Reales provisiones, indice cronológico* (*ibid.*); *Intendencia de ejército y real hacienda, indice cronológico* (*ibid.*); Alfred Coester, *Bibliografía de "Hugo Wast"* (Hispania, May); Stuart Culbertson, *George Ticknor's Interest in Spanish-American Literature* (*ibid.*); E. Arana, *De nuestra historia diplomática: El doctor Felipe Arana, ministro de relaciones exteriores de la confederación* (Estudios, July); Porfirio Pariña Núñez, *Los amores de Sarmiento* (Nosotros, May); Romulo D. Carbia, *La anarquia de 1820* (*ibid.*); Angel Rosenblat, *La lengua y la cultura de Hispanoamérica* (*ibid.*); Arthur Posnasky, *Precursores de Colón* (*ibid.*, June); Rómulo D. Carbia, *El mito de las Amazonas en América* (*ibid.*); Roy F. Nichols, *Trade Relations and the Establishment of the United States Consulates in Spanish America, 1779–1809* (Hispan. Am. Hist. Rev., Aug.); Allen G. Loosley, *The Puerto Bello Fairs* (*ibid.*); Dana G. Munro, *The Establishment of Peace in Nicaragua* (Foreign Affairs, July).

Documents: George Verne Blue, ed., *French Protests against Restrictions on Trade with Spanish America, 1778–1790* (Hispan. Am. Hist. Rev., Aug.); Vicente Lecuna, ed., *Correspondencia de Sucre* (Boletín de la Academia Nacional de la Historia, Jan., Mar.); Miguel Riofrio, *El doctor don Pedro Moncayo* (Boletín del Instituto Nacional Mejía, May).

W. S. R.

Contributions have been made to the section of Historical News by A. I. Andrews, F. B. Artz, G. C. Boyce, E. C. Burnett, E. N. Curtis, Tenney Frank, E. C. Helmreich, J. F. Jameson, W. T. Laprade, L. M. Larson, G. G. MacCurdy, Hunter Miller, A. T. Olmstead, W. S. Robertson, J. S. Roucek, G. N. Steiger, L. I. Strakhovsky, J. W. Thompson.